

The Slavic and East European Journal

Vol. XVII (New Series, Vol. III), No. 3

Fall 1959

CONTENTS

Lermontov and Dostoevskij's Novel

- The Devils Elisabeth Stenbock-Fermor 215

Ivan Bolotnikov in Soviet Historical

- Fiction Leon Twarog 231

Mark Aleksandrovič Ščeglov

- Walter Neef Vickery 242

English Loan Words in Russian

- Morton Benson 248

Teaching Russian to the Gifted Child in the Junior

- High School Norman Balfour Levin 268

The Present Status of Russian in Public, Private, and

- Parochial Schools of the United States... Fan Parker 272

REVIEWS

Robert F. Byrnes, Bibliography of American Publications on East Central Europe, 1945-1957.....

- Marc Raeff 280

Reuben A. Brower, ed., On Translation

- J. T. Shaw 281

George Steiner, Tolstoy or Dostoevsky: An Essay in the Old Criticism

- J. T. Shaw 283

Johannes Holthusen, Studien zur Ästhetik und Poetik des russischen Symbolismus

- George Ivask 285

Georgij Ivanov, 1943-1958 stixi

- Vladimir Markov 286

Yar Slavutych, Ivan Franko i Rusija

- V. N. Bandera 287

Symon Braha, <u>Mickiewicz i belaruskaja plyn' pol'skaje literatury</u>	Yar Slavutych	288
Charles Morley, ed. and tr., <u>Portrait of America: Letters of Henry Sienkiewicz</u>	Waclaw Lednicki	288
George Y. Shevelov and Fred Hollings, eds., <u>A Reader in the History of the Eastern Slavic Languages: Russian, Belorussian, Ukrainian</u>	Gerta Hüttl Worth	291
H. H. Bielfeldt, ed., <u>Rückläufiges Wörterbuch der russischen Sprache der Gegenwart</u>	Gerta Hüttl Worth	293
V. Tschebotarioff-Bill, ed., <u>The Russian People: A Reader on Their History and Culture</u>	Marthe Blinoff	294
John Turkevich and Ludmilla B. Turkevich, <u>Russian for the Scientist</u>	Thomas F. Magner	296
Jules Koslow, <u>The Kremlin: Eight Centuries of Tyranny and Terror</u>	S. Pushkarev	298
Alfred G. Meyer, <u>Leninism</u>	Robert C. Tucker	299
Ralph T. Fisher, Jr., <u>Pattern for Soviet Youth: A Study of the Congresses of the Komsomol, 1918-1954</u>	Frederick C. Barghoorn	300
Roman Gul', <u>Skif v Evrope: Bakunin i Nikolaj I</u>	Eugene Pyziur	302
Mikhail Zetlin, <u>The Decembrists</u> , tr. George Panin, Preface Michael M. Karpovich	M. Raeff	303
John A. Armstrong, <u>The Soviet Bureaucratic Elite: A Case Study of the Ukrainian Apparatus</u>	Joseph S. Roucek	304
<u>Le Livre de la genèse du peuple Ukrainien</u> , tr. Georges Luciani	J. B. Rudnyćkyj	305
Paul E. Zinner, ed., <u>National Communism and Popular Revolt in Eastern Europe; and [Marshall Andrews, ed.] Anatomy of Revolution</u>	A. J. Molnar	306
Clifford R. Barnett et al., <u>Poland: Its People, Its Society, Its Culture</u>	Mieczyslaw Giergiewicz	308
Books Received		309

NEWS AND NOTES	311
Transliteration	320

THE SLAVIC AND EAST EUROPEAN JOURNAL

Editor

J. T. Shaw
Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana

Associate Editors

Edward Stankiewicz
Walter Vickery
Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana

Review Editor

F. J. Oinas
Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana

Editorial Committee

Victor Erlich	J. B. Rudnyčkyj
Zbigniew Folejewski	Anthony Salys
William E. Harkins	Thomas A. Sebeok
The Rev. Walter C. Jaskiewicz, S.J.	Gleb Struve
Claude P. Lemieux	Nicholas Vakar
Horace Lunt	René Wellek
Oleg A. Maslenikov	

Business Manager

Edmund Ordon
Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan

THE SLAVIC AND EAST EUROPEAN JOURNAL

Published by the
AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS OF SLAVIC
AND EAST EUROPEAN LANGUAGES

The Slavic and East European Journal, a journal devoted to research and pedagogy, is the official publication of the American Association of Teachers of Slavic and East European Languages, AATSEEL of the U.S., Inc., an affiliate of AATSEEL of Canada. This publication is the successor to The AATSEEL Journal and The AATSEEL Bulletin. The Journal is published quarterly through the facilities of Indiana University.

Subscription to The Slavic and East European Journal is \$5.00 per year for individuals, libraries, and institutions. The subscription includes membership in the AATSEEL. A special rate of \$2.00 per year has been set for undergraduate and graduate students. Single copies may be purchased for \$1.50.

Applications for membership, subscriptions to the Journal, and all other business letters should be sent to the Executive Secretary and Treasurer: Edmund Ordon, Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan.

Communications to the Editor, books for review, manuscripts, exchange journals, and copy for advertisements should be sent to J. T. Shaw, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana.

The printed order of articles does not imply relative merit. Opinions expressed are not necessarily those of the editorial staff.

LERMONTOV AND DOSTOEVSKIJ'S NOVEL THE DEVILS

By Elisabeth Stenbock-Fermor

Smith College

Dostoevskij's notebooks from 1869 to 1872 are filled with remarks, memoranda, and fragments of dialogues which concern mostly The Devils and also a previously conceived novel The Life of a Great Sinner. The latter was never written, but it furnished certain characters to The Devils¹ and subsequent works of Dostoevskij. From the writer's correspondence his biographers learned that there existed a first draft of The Devils which differed greatly from the final text, and that it was discarded as a failure in August 1870, when "a new character appeared with claims to be the main hero."² From his wife's memoirs we know that the draft was burned in June 1871 and that she managed to preserve the notebooks.³ These notebooks unfold the development of the "new character," i.e., Stavrogin, and the changes which took place in the plot of the story. They support the content of the letters which relate the arduous process of rewriting the novel. They are full of contradictions in the description of the numerous characters of The Devils.

In the notebook labelled No. 2 by the editors, we find the following passages: "[Neča] St in the form of the hero of our time"; on the next page, speaking of the relationship of "Granovskij" and his "son," Dostoevskij wrote: "everything from him—as from the hero of our time."⁴ These notes are probably of February 1870. In the code which Dostoevskij used before he found names for his heroes, Neča stood for Nečaev, whose activities furnished the plot of the novel. He was also designated in the notebooks as St for student, and he finally became Petr Stepanovič Verxovenskij, the son of Stepan Trofimovič, who in the notebooks was Granovskij. At first Petr Verxovenskij was to be the

main hero, and he was displaced in this role by Stavrogin (Knjaz' in the notebooks) after a long process during which many features of Nečaev—Verxovenskij were carried over to the personality of Knjaz'—Stavrogin.⁵ It is evident that the first mention of the "hero of our time" was important to Dostoevskij, for he wrote it in particularly large handwriting. The name "Neča" is crossed out and replaced by an underlined "St," as if the two code-words did not designate one and the same person any more, or, as if a split in the personality of the revolutionary leader was taking place. The meaning of the other entry is not clear: the "from him" may refer either to "Granovskij" or to his "son," but, obviously, someone important was to be presented as a "hero of our time."

All through January and February, 1870, we see that Dostoevskij was hesitating as to the form of the novel and finally came to a decision: it was to be told in the first person, ot sebja, as part of the "chronicle of a province," and told "by the chronicler," ot xronikera.⁶ In the middle of January Dostoevskij wrote in his notebook that it was necessary for him to make "a psychological study, but a detailed one, of the influence of the work of writers, e.g., A Hero of Our Time on the child."⁷ This seems to apply to important childhood impressions of the future "Great Sinner," who partially became Stavrogin in The Devils. If we turn to Dostoevskij's Articles on Russian Literature⁸ and to A Writer's Diary,⁹ we will see that he considered Lermontov's novel influential not only in regard to children. We must also try to understand correctly the expression "in the form of." Does it refer to the character who is going to resemble Pečorin, Lermontov's "Hero," or to the form of the novel, or to both?¹⁰

The "Hero of Our Time" is presented by Lermontov through a system of various mirrors.¹¹ First, we have his portrait made by Maksim Maksimyč, an elderly army captain whose ignorance of the social and intellectual circle to which Pečorin belonged and whose utter unsophistication give to the presentation a certain objectivity. The second mirror is offered by the personal impressions of the ironical and sometimes sarcastic author, who after hearing Maksim Maksimyč's story, meets and observes Pečorin. It gives an image of Pečorin at the end of his career of evil,

when nothing remained to him except boredom and restlessness without hope. The third mirror is offered by Pečorin's memoirs which show him as he saw himself a short time before he met Maksim Maksimyč and during his acquaintance with him. They throw some light on his earlier adventures and on the background responsible for the development of his personality.

The system of mirrors was the technique used by Puškin in one of the Tales of Belkin, which Dostoevskij greatly admired as a whole. He considered that in the short story The Shot the first character of the Pečorin type appeared in Russian literature: "As if we had few Pečorins, who in real life committed many mean actions after reading A Hero of Our Time. The ancestor of these wicked homunculi was in our literature Silvio, in the story The Shot, taken by our pure-minded Puškin from Byron."¹² Silvio was also presented through three different mirrors: his description by the author "Mr. Belkin," his own confession, and the reminiscences of his former enemy. But in The Shot the plot was extremely simple; there were only four persons involved, and the author had no active part in the plot. Lermontov's novel is much more complex and consists of five different and, at times, interrelated stories, with very few persons in each.

Stavrogin, the character that appeared "with claims to be the main hero" and displaced Nečaev-Student-Verxoven-skij in that role, is also presented by Dostoevskij through mirrors which reflect the opinions of various persons. First, we have an account made by the author-chronicler of Stavrogin's early years; it is a summary of the town's gossip and the confidences of the boy's tutor. Then the author describes Stavrogin as he was when he first saw him. He closes this preliminary information with an appraisal of Stavrogin by one of Stavrogin's victims, Liputin, who compares Stavrogin to Pečorin.¹³ Only after that does the chronicler speak as an eyewitness of recent events. Stavrogin's confession, which was to be in Chapter IX (entitled At Tixon's)¹⁴ of Part II of the novel, casts some light on Stavrogin's mysterious past and shows him as he saw himself. This chapter, omitted from the novel by the publisher, was important in Dostoevskij's plan. In a letter to his niece, dated Jan. 18, 1871, he wrote that he could not dedicate the novel to her sister, who had asked for it, because she was a

young girl and somewhere in Part II or III there would be the confession of a crime: "I have not yet reached that place. It will perhaps be quite proper, but still at this point I would not dare dedicate it."¹⁵ Although Dostoevskij attempted to rewrite it several times, he was unable to make it "quite proper," and he finished the novel without the chapter At Tixon's. Later, when he published the novel as a separate book, he even eliminated the sentence stating that Stavrogin visited bishop Tixon, and also part of a conversation with Daša on visions of the devil which he discussed with the bishop. Stavrogin's last letter and a short conversation with Daša became the only documents which tell us what he really thought of himself. Thus we see that in one of Dostoevskij's plans for The Devils there was to be a three-facet mirror: Stavrogin as seen by a narrator, Stavrogin as seen by others in an account summarized by the narrator, and Stavrogin's confession.

But the narrator of a story with a plot as complicated as The Devils, with several important characters and many smaller parts, had a much harder task than the naive "Mr. Belkin" and Maksim Maksimyč and even than the imaginary author of A Hero. Even so, Maksim Maksimyč had to resort to eavesdropping to report conversations which he could not have heard otherwise, and the "author" had to observe Pečorin without being noticed by him. By these stratagems Lermontov kept the fiction of narrators-witnesses alive.

Dostoevskij had enough experience to foresee his many difficulties and in his notebook, while he was searching for a form, he wrote (it is the future "chronicler" speaking): "If I describe a conversation between two persons who are alone ... either I have good reason to know, or maybe I compose, but you may be sure that it is true."¹⁶ (The Russian text is: "požaluj socinjaju sam—no znajte čto vsě vero." Socinjaju was underlined.) In writing his "almost historical" novel¹⁷ as a chronicle compiled from different sources by an eyewitness of recent events who used other people's reminiscences, letters, and depositions, Dostoevskij did what Somerset Maugham described perfectly in The Razor's Edge:

I have taken the liberty that historians have taken from the time of Herodotus to put into the mouths of the persons of my narrative speeches that I did not myself hear and could not possibly have heard.

I have done this for the same reasons as the historians have, to give liveliness and verisimilitude to scenes that would have been ineffective if they had been merely recounted. I want to be read and I think I am justified in doing what I can to make my book readable. The intelligent reader will easily see for himself where I have used this artifice, and he is at perfect liberty to reject it. [Somerset Maugham, The Razor's Edge, (New York: Doubleday, 1944), Chapter I.]

Maugham's "artifice" means the same as Dostoevskij's "I compose". He also wanted to be read. In a letter Dostoevskij wrote immediately after sending off the first chapters, he declared: "At least it will be entertaining. (I have reached the point where I place entertainment above artistic quality.) As to artistic quality, I don't know, but it ought to be a success."¹⁸ The fiction of having the story told by a narrator who was not the conventional omniscient author permitted Dostoevskij to keep the "entertaining quality" alive quite naturally, because Stavrogin's past and the motives of his actions could remain hidden from the reader.

Lermontov's imaginary "author" of A Hero adopted an ironical and patronizing attitude towards the characters he described. Dostoevskij's "chronicler" did the same. Dostoevskij considered irony extremely important as a means of making a character of fiction seem more real. Straxov wrote to him after he read the first chapters: "The manner is charming, but not steadily followed through." Dostoevskij replied that he knew it and was worried by it. Later he wrote that he was "ruining" the novel.¹⁹ The further the story developed, the harder it became to stick to the "manner," and then there was no way to alter anything, for the first chapters had already been published. In many chapters the "chronicler" disappears altogether, and if the manner" is again strongly felt towards the end, it is because the end had been planned and drafted before the first chapters were sent off.²⁰ Dostoevskij later acknowledged that the form "from the chronicler" was responsible for the difficulties which the reader experienced in following the plot of the story. This confession of Dostoevskij is quoted by Dolinin in his book on the still unpublished "notebooks" belonging to the Raw Youth period.²¹

In the articles published by Dostoevskij in 1861, he

gives us the following description of Lermontov as an artist and as a man:

The other Demon—perhaps we loved him even more. How many excellent poems he wrote in ladies' albums, yet even G.-bov himself would not dare call him an album poet. He cursed and suffered, suffered for the good. He revenged himself and forgave, he wrote and laughed—he was generous and ridiculous. He liked to whisper strange tales to a sleeping young girl, and he stirred her virginal blood and drew up for her strange visions, which she ought not to dream, particularly as she had been so strictly and properly brought up. He told us his own life, his love affairs, in general he seemed to be mystifying us; half serious, half making fun of us. Our civilian employees knew him by heart and they all suddenly started acting as Mephistos, the minute they walked out of their offices. We sometimes did not agree with him, we felt depressed, and vexed, and sad, and sorry for someone, and angry. Finally he got bored with us, and jeered at us with the "bitter jeer of the deceived son at his bankrupt father," and he flew away

And over the peaks of the Caucasus
The exile from paradise flew!...

We followed his flight for a long time, but finally he died somewhere in a manner that was aimless, capricious, and even ridiculous.²²

Later, speaking of the verisimilitude of the literary type created by Puškin in *Onegin*, Dostoevskij writes:

That type finally penetrated into the consciousness of all our society and started to transform itself, being born anew with each generation. In Pečorin it achieved unquenchable bitter spite and a peculiarly Russian contrast of two heterogenous elements: egotism carried to self-deification, and at the same time spiteful disrespect of oneself. And still the same thirst for truth and activity, and the same eternally fatal: there is nothing for me to do! From spite and as if it were a joke, Pečorin throws himself into a strange activity which brings him to a stupid, ridiculous, useless death.²³

Šklovskij in his book *Za i protiv* objects to this passage that Dostoevskij identifies Lermontov with his hero to such an extent that he forgets about which of the two he is writing "because one cannot call the death of Pečorin in Persia ridiculous."²⁴ It seems to me that here Šklovskij forgets that

Pečorin had retired from the army and traveled in great comfort, probably for his pleasure and in order to fulfill his old dream: "I will go to America, Arabia, India—perchance I will die somewhere on the road!" Lermontov tells us: "Recently I learned that Pečorin died on his way home from Persia," which suggests an accident or an illness. In the case of a man who considered himself above other men, that death seems not less useless and ridiculous than Lermontov's fatal duel. But Šklovskij is right when he affirms that Dostoevskij identified Pečorin with his creator. "He told us his own life," writes Dostoevskij, and he uses the same words whether he speaks of the poet or of the product of his fancy. In The Devils, when he describes Stavrogin immediately after he received a slap in the face, Dostoevskij specifies: "In the matter of spite, of course, this was a progress over L-n, and even over Lermontov. There was perhaps more spite in Nikolaj Vladimirovič than in those two together."²⁵ Whether Dostoevskij means Lermontov himself or Lermontov's description of spite in Pečorin is not clear.

In the Writer's Diary of December 1877 Dostoevskij took up Lermontov's defense, against accusations that Lermontov was merely an imitator of Byron. He placed him, as a poet, immediately after Puškin, and to prove his point he attempted to dissociate Lermontov from the character he created: "If he had stopped bothering with the sick personality of the Russian intellectual tortured by his European culture . . . , and he ended by confusing Lermontov with Pečorin, ". . . he is gloomy, capricious, wants to tell the truth, but more often tells lies and knows it and suffers from it."²⁶

Another proof that Dostoevskij considered Lermontov a remarkable man, capable of awakening, as Pečorin did, strong and durable passions, is to be found in the memoirs of Polina Suslova. When she announced to Dostoevskij that she had a new lover, he was relieved to find out that her seducer was "no Lermontov"—not a dangerous man: she would forget, but one did not forget Lermontov-Pečorin.²⁷

We find another interesting mention of Lermontov in the notebooks: in an outline of "the Beauty," Dostoevskij writes: "a Lermontov in skirts." "The Beauty" is Liza, the girl who "was perhaps not goodlooking at all . . . and yet there was in this face something conquering and attracting! A

kind of power was expressed in the burning gaze of her dark eyes; she appeared 'as a conqueror and to conquer.'"²⁸ This passage resembles the description of Pečorin's gaze in A Hero, and of Lermontov's gaze in the memoirs that E. Suškova-Xvostova, who had been in love with him, published in 1869.²⁹ The critic Mixajlovskij in his article Geroj Bez-vremen'ja³⁰ speaks about Lermontov's powerful gaze and his capacity to charm and provoke hate at will. He used mostly reminiscences of Lermontov's contemporaries, who were also the contemporaries of Dostoevskij. The latter must have heard the stories which circulated on Lermontov in literary circles and, of course, he read whatever appeared in print on the subject.

The description of Stavrogin's courage in the scene of the "slap in the face" fits the description of Pečorin's courage during his duel with Grušnickij. Dostoevskij wrote: "He could stand in cold blood under his enemy's gun, could himself aim and kill with coldness bordering on ferocity."³¹ Earlier we are told that Stavrogin killed and crippled in duels. There are hints in A Hero of Our Time that Pečorin was also responsible for someone's death in the earlier period of his life.³² Even the duel, during which Stavrogin did not want to kill, is reminiscent of Lermontov's duel with Barante, when he deliberately shot in the air after his opponent missed him, and later acknowledged it, thereby insulting him.³³

In the notebooks Dostoevskij described the arrival of Stavrogin in a room and wrote that he on purpose "in the Pečorin manner" did not speak to the girl who was in love with him.³⁴ In describing the Pečorin type of man in the Diary, Dostoevskij used the words "unquenchable spite." He used the same words in describing Stavrogin's state of mind after he realized that he had lost his power over his mentally deranged wife. Immediately after that the desirability of her death is accepted by him.³⁵

In 1882 the Russkij vestnik published Lermontov's unfinished novel The Princess Ligovskij. The manuscript had been lying for "several years" in the publisher's office.³⁶ It was meant to be an autobiographical novel, and it described the life of a young Pečorin in Petersburg. It is obvious that this Pečorin later became the Pečorin of A Hero, although there are several discrepancies in the description of their

personalities. The main episode is identical with the story told by Suškova in her memoirs.

We do not know whether Dostoevskij's intimacy with publishing circles and particularly with the publisher of the Russkij vestnik gave him access to Lermontov's manuscript before he wrote The Devils and his articles of 1876, but there is a passage in The Devils where young Stavrogin is accused of trampling people down with horses, insulting people "for the pleasure of insulting them," and dishonoring a lady,³⁷ which seems a summary of young Pečorin's adventures in The Princess Ligovskij.³⁸ In that novel Pečorin's horses almost kill a man, and there is a hint that it is not the first accident of the kind. The Pečorin publicly insults that man, taking advantage of his poverty. The story described in detail the efforts of Pečorin to ruin the reputation of a girl with the sole purpose of gaining notoriety by his success. This is the "Suškova" episode.

In the Diary of 1876 Dostoevskij wrote that Pečorin killed because "he was not much to look at in his uniform, and at balls in the highest society in Petersburg did not seem a fine fellow in the eyes of the fair sex."³⁹ Now this is true of the Pečorin in Princess Ligovskij, who had "a rather unattractive exterior," "at balls was lost in the crowd of onlookers because of his unfavorable appearance," and "as he seldom danced, he could talk only to ladies who sat all night by the wall."⁴⁰ It also agrees with descriptions of Lermontov, but it does not agree with the information we gather in A Hero, where Pečorin, though not particularly handsome, is presented as irresistibly attractive to women.

I have earlier used the expression "the Pečorin type of man" on purpose. The problem is not one of imitation but of further development. Artistically successful literary characters were for Dostoevskij as real as actual men and could provide material for a new novel. He accepted as a great compliment Majkov's verdict that Stepan Trofimovič and Varvara Petrovna were "Turgenev characters in their old age."⁴¹

His first stories described characters obviously taken from Gogol's works. Dostoevskij acknowledged it and boasted: "I go into the depths. Gogol' takes people directly as a whole. I am more profound."⁴² How real his own

creations were for him is evident from his statements. He wrote about his stepson: "... a little more of that, and such a mood will produce a Gorskij or a Raskol'nikov."⁴³ Gorskij was a young man who had killed a whole family where he was employed as a tutor; Raskol'nikov was a product of Dostoevskij's imagination. In the Diary of 1876 we read: "Granovskij ... was one of the most sincere of our Stepan Trofimovičes (a representative of the idealists of the forties, which I brought forth in the novel The Devils and which the critics found correct)."⁴⁴ Just as Dostoevskij used the name of Stepan Trofimovič in the plural, to underline that he represented not an individual case but a human type of a particular historical period, he frequently used in the plural the names of real people and those of other writers' successful creations. In the Diary we find references to the Onegins, Rudins, Levins, Oblonskijs, and, of course, Pečorins. In 1873, when he presented The Devils to the Heir Apparent he wrote: "our Belinskijs and Granovskijs would not believe it if they were told that they are the direct forebears of the Nečaevians."⁴⁵ And in the Diary: "I do not concern myself in my novel with the personality of the famous Nečaev nor of his victim Ivanov. There is of course no likeness in the physiognomy of my Nečaev and the real Nečaev. I wanted to ask a question ... and give an answer to it; how so in our ... society become possible—not Nečaev, but Nečaevs, and how can it happen that these Nečaevs finally gather around them Nečaevians?"⁴⁶

When Lermontov published the second edition of A Hero, he added an introduction in which he replied to those who were looking for a model of Pečorin in real life: "A Hero of Our Time, gentlemen, is indeed a portrait, but not of one man: it is a portrait made up from the vices of our whole generation in their full development.... The author merely amused himself by describing the contemporary man as he understands him and ... as he too often met him."

There have been many arguments about the personality that served as a model to Stavrogin. The names of Bakunin and Spežnev have been advanced and discussed.⁴⁷ It seems to me that nothing would offend Dostoevskij more than the suggestion that the character he "took from his heart" was only the artistically treated portrait of a man, however remarkable he may be. He deeply resented criticism accusing him of describing with accuracy exclusive cases.⁴⁸ He

had himself criticized Ostrovskij for having made one of his characters "the portrait of an individual, faithful to reality, and no more."⁴⁹ He drew caricatures in his novels and painted portraits of secondary characters, but he shared the opinion of his time that an important literary character had to reflect important contemporary features. Dostoevskij's ideas on this problem of literary creation are expressed in many passages of his letters and of the *Diary*. In 1861 Dostoevskij wrote that Pečorin was a reincarnation of Onegin.⁵⁰ In the same article he came to the conclusion that because the next reincarnations of this literary type (Turgenev's heroes) had realized that they were becoming "superfluous men," the Russian intellectuals were on the road to salvation.

But the revolutionary ideas and violence of the sixties inclined Dostoevskij to reevaluate the role of the "homeless wanderer," the "superfluous man" who was becoming a dangerously active man. When, in 1862, he found at his door political leaflets which incited to murder and arson, he went to Černysevskij, who was considered the leader of the new generation and begged him to put an end to this activity.⁵¹ During his life abroad he became familiar with the revolutionary literature and met representatives of the movement. From his brother-in-law he obtained firsthand information on Nečaev's circle. He became certain that Russian society was witnessing a new reincarnation (not merely a replacement, as Šklovskij put it) of the type that was "born anew with each generation." At first he saw that reincarnation in Nečaev, but his artistic imagination turned Nečaev into a "comical" character, a "Xlestakov."⁵² The culminating point of the Russian intellectual's way to perdition, away and severed from the nation's gods, had to be represented by a romantic personality, a mastermind—Stavrogin, who was to be the last link in the chain started by Silvio.⁵³

The biographies of Pečorin and Stavrogin follow the same pattern: social life carried to dissipation and finally debauchery; then study; a career broken by reckless behaviour; boundless "ambition thwarted by circumstances" (the "circumstances" may be of their own making or created by social and political conditions). As a compensation for their thwarted ambition both enjoy acting as tempters: Pečorin with Azamat and women; Stavrogin, "the subtle serpent," in any situation. The lust for power over other human beings

and the joy derived from the capacity of inflicting mental anguish become their strongest motivation. But it is not the wickedness of their actions that places them aside from or, as they hope, above humanity, it is their mental attitude before and after committing them, their absolute indifference to other human beings while all their thoughts are concentrated on the analysis of their own reactions. As the bishop tells Stavrogin, even the rape of a young girl is not a unique crime; it is Stavrogin's self-glorification "in callousness and shamelessness which are not really in him," his "admiring of his own rationalizing" which make him both repulsive and ridicule and push him from one crime to another because ridicule is the only thing which men like Stavrogin and Pečorin fear, although they deny it.

Both achieved "egotism carried to self-deification and at the same time spiteful disrespect of oneself." This definition of Pečorin by Dostoevskij fits particularly well the Stavrogin of the Confession, of the conversation with Daša, and of his last letter. To Tixon he confesses that no longer knows whether he is telling the truth or not. In this he fits the description by Dostoevskij of Pečorin-Lermontov: "He wants to tell the truth, but more often tells lies, and knows it and suffers from his lying." Pečorin, after he has killed Grušnickij, ruined the life of Vera, Azamat, Bela, and probably Princess Mary (besides other victims he alludes to), asks: "Am I a fool or a criminal?" and "Is it education that made me as I am or did God create me that way?"⁵²

Lermontov did not answer the question, but he depicted the same type of man in his Demon and in the poem Duma, to which certain thoughts of Pečorin are a variant in prose. (Analogies between the Demon, the eternal exile and tempter, and the self-styled exile and tempter of Dostoevskij's novel would be easy to find: the Demon is "neither darkness nor light"; Stavrogin is "neither cold nor hot," and "bewitching as the demon."⁵³ Indifference to good or evil except as potential sources of pleasure is common to Pečorin and Stavrogin. Boredom is also the common lot of these characters.

In 1861 Dostoevskij, as we have seen, made the following definition of the Pečorin type: "the same thirst for truth and activity and the same eternally fatal: there is nothing for me to do." In 1872 the bishop was saying to Stavrogin: There is one punishment that falls upon those

who divorce themselves from their native soil: boredom and tendency toward idleness even where there is desire to work." On the environment which produced this type of man the bishop says: "Apparently one does not become a foreigner in one's own country with impunity." While Dostoevskij writes to the Heir Apparent: "It is the direct consequence of the great severance of all education from the ancestral and national sources of Russian life."⁵⁴ And to Pečorin's question on the reason of his being what he is, Dostoevskij answered in 1877: "The Russian intellectual tortured by his European culture."

It has been mentioned by commentators that many traits of such characters belong to the usual features of the romantic hero.⁵⁵ Lermontov knew it, as Puškin knew it, and both named the models which their heroes were imitating: Childe Harold, the Vampire, and others. Dostoevskij acknowledged the role of Byronism in the creation of the Russian "homeless wanderer," but he believed that because these models were non-Russian and because their imitators started wandering out of Russia and ignored or despised everything Russian, they developed Pečorin's "egotism carried to self-deification and, at the same time, spiteful disrespect of oneself." These, being combined with "thirst for truth and activity" transformed the harmless psychological case into a national and political danger.⁵⁶

Whether Lermontov would have recognized Stavrogin as a reincarnation of Pečorin thirty years after his death is another problem. Yet, for Dostoevskij, Stavrogin was like Pečorin "a portrait made up from the vices of our whole generation in their full development" and thus a new "Hero of Our Time."

Notes

1. F. M. Dostoevskij, "Besy," in Polnoe sobranie udožestvennyx proizvedenij (Gosizdat, 1926-30), Vol. VII. Translated by Constance Garnett and published under the title The Possessed (New York: The Modern Library, 1936). Stavrogin's "Confession," translated by Avrahm Yarmolinsky, is at the end of the volume.

2. F. M. Dostoevskij, Pis'ma (Moskva, 1928-59), II, 282, 286, 288, 290, 294. The story of the creation of the novel can be reconstructed from the "commentary" to the

letters by A. Dolinin. It has also been told by E. H. Carr, Dostoevsky (New York, 1931); K. Močul'skij, Dostoevskij (Paris: YMCA Press, 1947); E. J. Simmons, Dostoevsky (London, 1950); A. Yarmolinsky, Dostoevsky (New York, 1957).

3. A. G. Dostoevskaja, Vospominanija (Moskva, 1925), p. 136.

4. Zapisnye tetradi F. M. Dostoevskogo (Moskva: Academia, 1935), pp. 157, 158.

5. The names Dostoevskij chose for his characters often had a special meaning. It has been mentioned by various commentators that Šatov was derived from šatat'sja and Verxovenskij from verxovenstvovat'. These words are used in the notebooks in reference to these persons. Močul'skij (p. 376) derived Stavrogin from the Greek word stauros (cross). It could also be derived from stavit' roga (to cuckold); the word roga appears in that particular meaning in the same paragraph as the earliest mentions of the name Stavrogin. Zapisnye tetradi, p. 61.

6. Zapisnye tetradi, pp. 89, 108, 136, 137.

7. Ibid., p. 101.

8. Polnoe sobranie, Vol. XIII, "Rjad statej o russkoj literature."

9. Ibid., Vols. XI, XII, "Dnevnik pisatelja." Translated by Boris Brazol: The Diary of a Writer (New York: Scribner's, 1949).

10. M. Ju. Lermontov, Sočinenija (Moskva, 1957), Vol. VI, "Geroj našego vremeni." Translated by Vladimir Nabokov, A Hero of Our Time (New York: Doubleday, 1958).

11. See A. Ginzburg, Tvorčeskiy put' Lermontova (Leningrad, 1940), pp. 165 ff., and also Nabokov's Introduction to A Hero of Our Time.

12. Polnoe sobranie, XI, 180, 181. On Dostoevskij's opinion of Povesti Belkina see A. Dolinin, V tvorčeskoy laboratorii Dostoevskogo (Sovetskiy Pisatel', 1947), pp. 65, 67, 137.

13. "Besy," p. 86.

14. Ibid., p. 592.

15. Pis'ma, II, 315 ff.

16. Zapisnye tetradi, p. 136.

17. Pis'ma, III, 50.

18. Ibid., II, 296, 297.

19. Ibid., II, 336, 366.

20. Ibid., II, 332, 333.
21. V tvorčeskoj laboratorii, pp. 67, 135. How easy it is to forget the "narrator," is evident from the fact that both Carr (p. 223) and Simmons (p. 202) misunderstood the chronicler's reference to "a certain scoundrel Lebjadkin" and ascribed this mistake to the changes which occurred in Dostoevskij's plans. This scornful allusion to Lebjadkin is in accordance with the chronicler's "manner": he belongs to the city's society—Lebjadkin does not.
22. Polnoe sobranie, XIII, 50, 51. The first "demon" is Gogol'; "G.-ov" is Dobroljubov; the "tales to a sleeping young girl," Skazka dlja detej. The first quotation is from the poem Duma, the second from The Demon.
23. Ibid., XIII, 103.
24. V. Šklovskij, Za i protiv (Moskva, 1957), p. 232.
25. "Besy," p. 170.
26. Polnoe sobranie, XII, 353-354.
27. A. P. Suslova, Gody blizosti s Dostoevskim (Moskva, 1928), p. 52.
28. "Besy," p. 91.
29. E. A. Xvostova—Suškova, "Zapiski," Vestnik Evropy (1869).
30. N. K. Mixajlovskij, "Geroj Bezvremen'ja," Sobranie Sočinenij (S.-Peterburg, 1897), V, 326, 347.
31. "Besy," pp. 169, 170.
32. Lermontov, VI, 271, 301, 321.
33. Ibid., pp. 451, 745.
34. Zapisnye tetradi, p. 73.
35. "Besy," p. 229.
36. Russkij vestnik, 1882, No. 157, note on p. 120; and No. 158, P. Viskovatov, "Po povodu Knjagini Ligovskoj."
37. "Besy," p. 35.
38. Lermontov, VI, 123, 133, 143.
39. Polnoe sobranie, XI, 180, 181.
40. Lermontov, VI, 124, 131.
41. Pis'ma, II, 333.
42. Ibid., I, 86, 87.
43. Ibid., II, 118.
44. Polnoe sobranie, XI, 342.

45. Pis'ma, III, 50.
46. Polnoe sobranie, XI, 129 ff.
47. L. Grossman i V. Polonskij, Spor o Bakunine (Gosizdat, 1926). On Spešnev see the article by V. Lejkina, Byloe, Vol. XXV (1924); also Močul'skij, pp. 107-109.
48. V tvorčeskoj laboratorii, pp. 147, 148.
49. Pis'ma, I, 306.
50. See above, p. 220 and note 23.
51. Polnoe sobranie, XI, 23, 24. Also N. G. Černyševskij, Polnoe sobranie sočinenij (Moskva, 1939), I, 777, 778, 819 ff.
52. Zapisnye tetradi, pp. 53, 55.
53. Ibid., p. 91. Also Simmons p. 205.
54. Pis'ma, III, 50.
55. Lermontov, VI, 231, 232.
56. Zapisnye tetradi, p. 217.

IVAN BOLOTNIKOV IN SOVIET HISTORICAL FICTION

By Leon I. Twarog

Boston University

The very first task undertaken by Soviet historical novelists was the depiction of what the critic M. Serebrjanskij in 1936 designated as the "genealogy of the revolution."^{1,2} That Soviet writers, particularly in the period just following the revolution, should be interested in portraying the separate links that finally culminated in the October revolution is understandable. Even more understandable is the fact that interest was centered primarily on the revolutions from below, on the so-called peasant revolutions. Of these, however, only four have sufficient drama, interest, and national significance in Russian history to warrant full-scale treatment in novel form, namely, the risings of Ivan Bolotnikov and Sten'ka Razin in the 17th century, and those of Kondrat Bulavin and Emeljan Pugačëv in the 18th century.³

Definitive Soviet works on these subjects have been slow in appearing. A. Čapygin's timely Razin Stepan (1928) maintained its position as the Soviet classic on Razin until it was displaced by S. Zlobin's Stepan Razin in 1952.⁴ D. Petrov-Birjuk's Dikoe pole (1946) is virtually the only Soviet novel dealing with the Bulavin uprising of 1707. V. Šiškov's Emel'jan Pugačëv appeared in its final form only in 1947.⁵ A novel comparable in size and scope on the theme of Bolotnikov did not appear in the U.S.S.R. until 1956, despite the fact that the Bolotnikov rising was the first peasant-revolutionary movement in Russia, that it was by far the largest and most significant rising, and that it was led by a real peasant whose former owner actually ended up under his command. Thus, even the basic "unvarnished" subject matter would appear to be ideally suited for treatment in Soviet historical fiction.

It is also somewhat surprising that no novelist of talent took up the cue given by Stalin in 1931 when, in an interview

with the writer Emil Ludwig, he stated that the Bolsheviks had always been interested in such historical personalities as Bolotnikov, Razin, Pugačëv, and others, and that the risings headed by them, even though unsuccessful, were interesting as the first attempts of the peasantry to free itself. But Stalin also hastened to explain that in no case could such a rising succeed because there was no working class to lead it.⁶

The Bolotnikov theme offers great possibilities for the historical novelist because so little is known about Bolotnikov that the author can use his imagination without violating history, and because what is known of him, even without embellishment of any kind, has all the essential ingredients for a historical novel on an exotic theme.⁷ Ivan Bolotnikov was a xolop or serf, who in the year 1600, at the age of 19, fled from his master to the Cossacks, and shortly thereafter was captured by Tatars and sold as a slave in Turkey. For some years he worked on a galley as oarsman, and when the Turks were defeated at sea, Bolotnikov was freed and brought to Venice where he lived for some time. On hearing of the great changes that had taken place in Russia, that Dmitrij had fled, that Vasilij Šujskij was now tsar, and that there was unrest in the country, he decided to return to his fatherland. In Poland he met Mixail Molčanov, Dmitrij's secretary who had escaped with the tsar's seal, and who now passed himself off as the Tsar Dmitrij. Molčanov appointed Bolotnikov commander-in-chief of his forces in Russia. The Bolotnikov forces in the 1606-7 uprising were made up of serfs, peasants, Cossacks, gentry, and even boyars. At one point Bolotnikov's 100,000 man army actually besieged Moscow for a little more than a month. Eventually Bolotnikov was forced to surrender at Tula because Šujskij's forces had built a dam across the local river and were proceeding to inundate the town. Šujskij did not keep his promise to pardon Bolotnikov, but had his eyes put out, and then had him drowned. This then, is the spectacular framework within which the historical novelist must work.

At the time of Stalin's statement several short works on Bolotnikov did exist, and a few more were scheduled to make their appearances in the thirties, but none of them encompassed the broad scope of Soviet novels on similar

themes. The first Soviet novel on Bolotnikov was written by M. Šiškevič in 1926, and was followed by G. Štorm's 190-page Povest' o Bolotnikove in 1930, a work generally considered worthy of inclusion in any listing of the best Soviet historical novels in the thirties. It had attained a third edition by 1934, and in 1937 was one of the few Soviet novels selected for mass distribution in a special series entitled "Istoričeskie Romany." In 1938, a revised edition was approved for use in the middle schools.⁸

G. Dobržinskij published a 125-page novelette entitled Xolop Ivaška Bolotnikov in 1932, and remade it into a play in 1938.⁹ The poet Vasilij Kamenskij, who had already written on the themes of Sten'ka Razin and Pugačëv, published a narrative poem on Bolotnikov in 1934. I. Sel'vinskij's five-act tragedy, Rycar' Ioann appeared in 1938.¹⁰ Finally, T. Bogdanovič's Xolop-Opolčenec (1939), a large work intended to cover the entire Time of Troubles, also includes a section on Bolotnikov.¹¹ The appearance of so many new and revised works in the late thirties can be ascribed to the generally increased interest in historical fiction at that time, and to the awareness that the Bolotnikov theme had not yet been amply treated in Soviet historical fiction. However, not until 1956 did a substantial, 400-page, novel on Bolotnikov appear—A. Savel'ev's Syn Krestjanskij.¹² This paper is concerned primarily with the works by Savel'ev and Štorm, as the most important prose works on the subject.

In his short work Povest' o Bolotnikove, Štorm gives us little more than a glimpse of Bolotnikov as the leader of the uprising, since two-thirds of the novel is taken up with descriptions of the reigns of Boris Godunov and Dmitrij I, and of Bolotnikov's adventures prior to the rising. At the same time, Štorm does not invent incidents from Bolotnikov's childhood, so that all we know about him is that he is literate, clever, bold, a peasant on the estate of Prince Teljatovskij. He makes his way to the Volga, becomes a fisherman, and is captured by the Tatars. His stay abroad teaches him that the life of the common people is bad everywhere, not just in Russia, and so eventually he wants to do something about this, or so he tells Molčanov whom he accepts as the legitimate tsar. Later when he enlists the aid of others, Bolotnikov tells of his travels, and states that he

had actually seen the tsar, spoken with him, and could report that the tsar was a true "peasant tsar."

Although members of the gentry and boyar groups co-operate with Bolotnikov at first, they do so only because of their dissatisfaction with Šujskij. When it becomes apparent that Bolotnikov is opposed to all members of the upper classes, some of these desert to Tsar Šujskij's forces. Šujskij, in keeping with the convention of that time, is portrayed as a drunkard, a senile, repulsive, debauched old man. In an attempt to pass judgment on Šujskij, and to express some hope for the future of Russia, Štorm includes on the very last pages, a starina sung by the blind Bolotnikov in which he tells how he tried to do away with injustice on earth, and of how he failed. But neither Bolotnikov nor the author has recourse to the standard formula of Soviet fiction which states that even though the hero may die, there are others who will carry on his work, and that ultimately the people will attain the happiness they strive for. In this respect Štorm's novel differs considerably from that of Čapygin who, in his idealized portrayal of Sten'ka Razin, has Sten'ka affirm this most passionately.

In other respects, however, Štorm adheres to the Čapygin tradition, especially as concerns the archeological aspects of the novel, and, in particular, in the use of the language of the period, not only in short quoted passages, or in the speech of his characters, but quite often even in the descriptive passages given by the author. The plot itself is very thin, and Štorm seems most interested in exercising formalist techniques, and in presenting the reader with unusual bits of information, such as the story of how the British Order of the Garter originated.¹³ Štorm also has inherited some of Čapygin's or Kamenskij's predilection for naturalistic description. In one instance he has a commanding officer deliberately bite off the ear of a freshly killed soldier, and chew on it, as one would a piece of chewing gum ("Streleckij golova otkusil odnomu iz ubityx uxo i dolgo ževal ego").¹⁴

The fact that none of Bolotnikov's pronouncements are really as violent as those one finds in other Soviet novels on revolutionary themes, and the fact that Štorm seems to be amusing himself with his material, probably means that he, like many other writers at that time, sought refuge in the historical novel during the R.A.P.P. period. Štorm's

Povest' o Bolotnikove has very definite limitations and drawbacks since it does not delve into its subject matter too deeply, but one must agree with Gor'kij's statement that it is indeed a talented work.¹⁵

The same cannot be said for the short work by Dobržinskij, or for those sections of Bogdanovič's novel which deal with the Bolotnikov rising, since the treatment is very superficial and aimed at school children. Kamenskij's poem of 1934, in the tradition of his earlier works of Pugačëv and Sten'ka Razin, espouses a furious and violent revolutionary romanticism which makes for entertaining reading, but which unfortunately has little regard for history itself. As in Štorm's work, Bolotnikov believes that the man he saw in Poland was the real tsar. Kamenskij's poem is perhaps best remembered for the blasphemous and vile portraits of Tsar Šujskij and church officials. In a section entitled "The Royal Bathhouse" we are shown how the tsar, the metropolitan, and members of Šujskij's private council gather together in a bathhouse where Šujskij is steaming himself, in order to decide on important affairs of state, and to drink until they can hardly stand.¹⁶

Sel'vinskij and Dobržinskij, in their dramas of the late thirties, also presented the tsar in most uncomplimentary fashion without, however, descending to the level of Kamenskij. When they were both criticized for this, Sel'vinskij defended his portrayal of Šujskij on the pages of Literaturnaja gazeta.¹⁷ Both Dobržinskij and Sel'vinskij had looked to previous works for guidance, and had simply been caught in the shift to a new historical attitude. After 1936, a new Soviet patriotism, and a better regard for past leaders of the Russian nation, irrespective of their faults, became the more accepted tradition. Sel'vinskij reflects this somewhat by indicating that state interest began to play an increasingly larger part in the thinking of all men of power in Russia at that time. Bolotnikov, for example, refused to accept the aid of Polish troops because he wanted to keep the Russian land out of the hands of the Poles. Šujskij, his opponent, also sees this as a scheme whereby the Poles and the Pope hope to control Russia.¹⁸

In Dobržinskij's drama the theme of patriotism plays an even stronger part. The anti-Polish, anti-Catholic, anti-Jesuit pronouncements are somewhat more violent than in Sel'vinskij's work. Bolotnikov, at the very end of the play,

stands before Šujskij and asks him why he has brought the Swedes into Russia, and why he has made it possible for foreign wolves to tear Russia to pieces. Both plays conclude with optimistic prophecy, but Dobržinskij also includes a threat, that no matter who the enemy may be—evil, conceited Pole, or the shrewd Swede—once he violates the Russian border, he is doomed.¹⁹

Almost twenty years elapsed before a new prose work on the subject of Bolotnikov appeared, even though earlier works were outdated. Undoubtedly, the reluctance of Soviet writers to turn to this theme, or to the Time of Troubles in general, stems from the fact that very many inglorious pages of Russian history are to be found there. Only after I. I. Smirnov's new History of the Bolotnikov Rising was published in 1949 was interest re-vitalized to the point that someone ventured to publish a new novel.

A. Savel'ev's Syn krest'janskij was published in 1956. As the only literary product of a man already at retirement age—it is a labor of love.²⁰ But precisely because it is a labor of love, Savel'ev is unwilling to leave out any of the facts he has so painstakingly accumulated over the years, and consequently includes many interesting, informative, and educational, but not absolutely essential details, such as information about the ikon painter Andrej Rublëv, or that the Russians had manufactured their own cannon back in the time of Dmitrij Donskoj, or that a Russian had attempted to perfect a flying machine even before Leonardo de Vinci. Often Savel'ev's mania for exact reproduction of archeological detail borders on the ridiculous. On one occasion, the author is so anxious to have the reader view the interior of a luxurious carriage that he contrives to have the vehicle stop very briefly, and for the door to be open just long enough to permit our hero to glance inside, to photograph this interior in his mind's eye, and then to describe it in such detail as if he had been studying it for years.²¹

A lack of restraint, and the mistaken notion that one best reproduces the atmosphere of a period by including as much of the language of the time as possible, makes for difficult reading. This is especially true when standard, contemporary Russian is infused with Polish, Ukrainian, Church Slavic, Old Russian, and short statements in German, Latin, Italian, and Greek—although these are always accompanied by footnotes. What could be designated as the

educative function is part and parcel of the task of the Soviet historical novelist, but such indiscriminate use of archeological material is hardly to be tolerated in the U.S.S.R. today where the methods employed by A. N. Tolstoj in his novel Pëtr Pervyj are viewed as the accepted standard.²²

Generally speaking, Savel'ev follows Smirnov's interpretation of historical facts, and on occasion even borrows entire scenes from him. But whereas Smirnov, as a historian, could not fill in the blank spots in the life of Bolotnikov, Savel'ev, as a novelist, was perfectly free to do so. He also had some freedom in selection of material to be emphasized or de-emphasized. Consequently Savel'ev tends to omit or to tone down unfavorable elements in the Bolotnikov uprising, and to emphasize those in which Bolotnikov and his forces are shown to good advantage. At the very beginning of the rising, for example, he very conveniently fails to mention the first defeat sustained by Bolotnikov, and spends all too few pages on the inglorious stay of the troops at Tula.²³

As in the old Russian byliny, Savel'ev first tells us about Bolotnikov's childhood in order to enumerate those qualities which were to be so important later on. Bolotnikov is a fearless individual from the very first, he fights with children older than he, defends the weak and helpless, and exhibits great presence of mind. He flees from the Teljatevskij estate after killing the local overseer, who has been oppressing the common people, and begins life with the Cossacks. After proving himself in battle, he is selected by his ataman to lead 1,000 Cossacks on a secret mission into Poland to aid the Ukrainians who are fighting for their liberty. At that time Bolotnikov predicts that Kiev will one day be returned to Russia because this is what the common people are longing for. Later in the novel many Ukrainians, Cossacks, and Carpatho-Russians come to the aid of Bolotnikov in his struggle against Šujskij, and these invariably indicate their hatred of the Poles, and their love for the Russians. Savel'ev has exaggerated the intense desire of the Cossacks and the Carpatho-Russians to fuse with the Russian state, especially at a time when Russia itself was so weak. Rather we must consider their participation in the Bolotnikov rising as little more than pure opportunism. What Savel'ev does is to give history just enough of a twist to justify on a historical basis the fact that the Ukraine did eventually come

under Russian control in the latter part of the seventeenth century, and that more recently, as a result of World War II, the Carpatho-Ukraine has also been incorporated in the Soviet Union.

Smirnov expresses some doubt as to whether or not Bolotnikov knew that Molčanov was not the tsar, but does not go beyond this. However, Savel'ev's Bolotnikov is always acutely aware of the fact that Molčanov is not the tsar, but that a tsar is a necessity if the rising is to succeed. Bolotnikov is also aware of the social contradictions inherent in the rising, and in the end, he is not at all surprised to find that some of the gentry desert to Šujskij. Whereas in previous works Bolotnikov generally admitted that he had seen the tsar with his own eyes, in Savel'ev's novel Bolotnikov is very careful not to make any such statements. He realizes that the common people must find their own way to happiness and freedom despite the boyars, the landowners, and tsars.

Tsar Vasiliј Šujskij is not presented in a favorable light by Savel'ev, but the extremely defamatory descriptions which were so characteristic of those works published in the thirties are absent. When Sevel'ev does want to ridicule Šujskij, he never describes him directly, but rather describes the tsar's silhouette on a wall and the grotesque patterns it assumes.

Savel'ev's novel emphasizes the belief that personal privations are justified and even desirable if they contribute to the well-being of the nation. At intervals the author exercises his duty as a historical novelist working within the framework of socialist realism to "peek into the tomorrow," and has his characters affirm "if not we, then our heirs will attain this good life."²⁴ Bolotnikov just prior to his death says to his jailer: "Tell Vas'ka Šujskij that death does not terrify me. I shall die, but the people know that the seeds sown by me will grow. Let the tsar beware of the people's anger."²⁵ And so Bolotnikov perishes, but the author asserts that the waves of peasant uprisings kept on growing, and that on the crests of these new waves there appeared new people: Stepan Razin, Kondrat Bulavin, and Emel'jan Pugačëv. He concludes by stating that even three hundred years later, legends and songs about this national leader the peasant son Ivan Bolotnikov, still exist, and that he (Bolotnikov) will not be forgotten.

The novel, therefore, ends on the traditional if somewhat monotonous optimistic note prescribed for the Soviet historical novelist who writes on the peasant-revolutionary theme. What could be called the "genealogy of the centralized state" had already been fully documented in Soviet historical prose, but Savel'ev is the first Soviet novelist to link the four important peasant-revolutionary movements, and to complete the "genealogy of the peasant revolution." However, Savel'ev's novel does not compare in quality with Zlobin's Stepan Razin or Šiškov's Emel'jan Pugačëv, even though it treats its subject matter much more fully than any previous Soviet work on Bolotnikov, and does give the correct ideological interpretation of the Bolotnikov rising at this time. From a literary point of view, the best Soviet prose work on Bolotnikov is still Štorm's Povest' o Bolotnikove, but Štorm simply fails to realize fully the tremendous potentialities of the theme. The definitive Soviet novel on Bolotnikov still remains to be written.

Notes

1. This paper was read at the Fifteenth Annual Meeting of the AATSEEL in New York City, in December 1958.

2. M. Serebrjanskij, Sovetskiy istoričeskij roman (Moskva, 1936), p. 53.

3. Attempts have been made to exploit the theme of the revolution from below even where the subject matter does not warrant full-scale treatment, as in the case of minor urban uprisings, or facets of one of the major uprisings. To this group belong Čapygin's Guljašcie ljudi (1938) which tells of the so-called "copper uprising" in Moscow in 1662, Zlobin's Ostrov Bujan (1929) which deals with the Pakov uprising of 1650, and his Salavat Julaev (1941) which gives the story of the Baškir leader who joined the Pugačëv forces.

4. For a detailed discussion of the reasons why Čapygin's novel was abandoned in favor of Zlobin's novel, see my article, "Changing Patterns of a Revolutionary Hero," Slavonic and East European Review, XXXII (June 1954), 367-384.

5. Fragments of his novel first appeared in the journal Zvezda in 1935, and Book I of his trilogy was published in Literaturnyj sovremennik as early as 1938.

6. I. Stalin, "Beseda s nemeckim pisatelem Emilem Ljudvigom," Bol'sevik, 8 (1932), p. 37.
7. Biographical data is derived primarily from I. I. Smirnov, Kratkij očerk istorii vosstaniya Bolotnikova (Moskva, 1953), and his larger work Vosstanie Bolotnikova (Moskva, 1949). Smirnov's is the most comprehensive historical work on Bolotnikov to date.
8. M. Šiškevič, Ivan Bolotnikov: Istoričeskaja povest' iz epoxi krestjanskix vosstanij 17-go veka, Zemlja i Fabrika (Moskva, 1926); G. Storm, Povest' o Bolotnikove (three edns.: Moskva, 1930; [Istoričeskie romany, serija 1937 g., No. 2] Moskva: Žurgazob"edinenie, 1937; [Avtorskaja obabotka; dlja nepoln. sred. i sred. školy] Moskva: Detizdat, 1938).
9. G. Dobržinskij, Xolop Ivaška Bolotnikov: Istoričeskaja povest' (Moskva, 1932). The play was completed in 1937, staged in 1938, but apparently not published until 1940. G. Dobržinskij, Ivan Bolotnikov, P'esa v 4 d. (Moskva: Iskusstvo, 1940).
10. V. Kamenskij, Ivan Bolotnikov: Poema (Moskva, 1934); I. Sel'vinskij, Rycar' Ioann: Tragedija v 5 aktax (Moskva, 1939). The work was completed in December of 1937, first published in Oktjabr', No. 5, 1938, staged the same year, but published in book form only in 1939.
11. T. Bogdanovič, Xolop-Opolčenec (1606-1612 gg.), Kn. I (1606-1609) (Moskva, 1939).
12. A. Savel'ev, Syn krestjanskij: Povestvovanie (Moskva: Voennoe Izdatel'stvo Ministerstva Obrony Sojuza SSR, 1956).
13. Štorm, Povest' o Bolotnikove, p. 45.
14. Ibid., p. 93.
15. M. Gor'kij, O literature (Moskva, 1933), p. 54.
16. V. Kamenskij, Ivan Bolotnikov, pp. 97-118.
17. Dobržinskij's play was reviewed by B. Emel'janov, "Ivan Bolotnikov v Teatre Revoljucii," Literaturnaja gazeta, 1938, No. 68; Sel'vinskij's drama was reviewed by A. Evgen'ev, "Rycar' Ioann I. Sel'vinskogo," Literaturnaja gazeta, 1938, No. 31; Sel'vinskij's rebuttal, "Obraz Vasilija Sujskogo," appeared in No. 57 of the same paper. It is most interesting that in a post-war, two-volume collected edition of Sel'vinskij's work, with the exception of a few stylistic changes, the drama has been only very slightly modified as regards the portrait of Vasilij Šujskij. Il'ja Sel'vinskij, Izbrannye proizvedenija v dvux tomakh, Tom vtoroj, Tragedii (Moskva, 1956).

18. Sel'vinskij, Rycar' Ioann, pp. 35, 50, 139.
19. Dobržinskij, Ivan Bolotnikov, p. 194.
20. A. Savel'ev, according to the biographical data given in a Preface to the novel, is a practicing radiologist at one of the hospitals in Kaluga. He was 67 years of age when his novel was published. He tells us that he simply gathered material over a period of years in his spare time, was fascinated by the subject matter, and consequently wanted his contemporaries to know more about this important subject. He began working on his novel in 1944.
21. A. Savel'ev, Syn krest'janskij, p. 155.
22. The campaign against excessive use of the language of the period, if the period were at all remote, erupted in full force in the early fifties when controversy centered on V. Jazwickij's Ivan III. Even some of the better-known historical novelists such as Ol'ga Forš were criticized for similar faults. See A. Tarasenkov, "Za bogatstvo i čistotu russkogo literaturnogo jazyka," Novyj Mir, No. 2 (Moskva, 1951), pp. 203-220; P. Pustovajt, "Jazyk istoričeskogo romana," Literaturnaja gazeta, April 10, 1951, and "Ivan III," Znamja, No. 1, 1950, pp. 172-175.
23. Smirnov, Kratkij očerk, p. 62.
24. When it becomes apparent that the rising is doomed, these prophecies increase in frequency. Savel'ev, Syn krest'janskij, pp. 360, 361, 370, 397, 399, 400.
25. Savel'ev, p. 397.

MARK ALEKSANDROVIČ ŠČEGLOV

By Walter Neef Vickery

Indiana University

In September 1953 a young Soviet literary scholar published his first critical article. It was on Tolstoj, and it appeared in Novyj mir. Three years later, on September 2, 1956, at the age of thirty, the young man died. From the age of two he had suffered from tuberculosis of the bone. His name was Mark Aleksandrovič Ščeglov. His death appears to have passed unnoticed in the West. But three short years in print had sufficed to gain him a reputation in the Soviet Union. Ščeglov's obituary notice in the second volume of Literaturnaja Moskva¹ was signed by no less than fifty-two writers and critics. Among the signatures were the names of Tvardovskij, Fedin, Èrenburg, Pasternak, Dudincev, Nekrasov, Kaverin, and Kazakevič. How did it come about that these distinguished and well-established writers felt impelled to put on record their admiration and respect? The aim of this brief article is to throw some light on the question.

Before, however, attempting an answer, let me call attention to the passage which concludes the Literaturnaja Moskva obituary tribute: "To collect together and publish everything written by Mark Ščeglov is not only a duty for our writing public but an urgent need in the life of our literature. And only when this has been done and a book with Mark Ščeglov's name on the cover takes its place on the shelf, only then will we fully understand the loss which our literature has suffered."² This work has now been done—in part. Literaturno-kritičeskie stat'i, furnished with a generous foreword by Professor N. Gudzij, contains most of Ščeglov's critical works, some not previously published.³ It is regrettable—not only for the sake of the record—that certain Ščeglov articles, some controversial, have been omitted. I have in mind "Bez muzykal'nogo soprovodženija,"⁴ "'Russkij les' Leonida Leonova,"⁵ in which Ščeglov

touched on the thorny problem of "capitalist remnants"; finally his "Realizm sovremennoj dramy,"⁶ probably by far the most reflective pronouncement in recent years on the true nature of dramatic conflict. It may be there are further omissions which have escaped my notice. Of the three articles mentioned here the first two were both criticized on ideological grounds at the same time as V. Pomerancev's "Ob iskrennosti v literature."⁷ Whatever the orthodox Soviet attitude to the three articles may be—and it is unlikely to be one of enthusiasm—they should have found their legitimate place in the 1958 collection of Ščeglov's works. For they are not in any sense immature outpourings out of character with the rest of Ščeglov's work; on the contrary they bear the stamp of his critical mind, are typical of Ščeglov's approach.

No attempt will here be made at an exhaustive examination of Ščeglov's work as a critic and literary scholar. I must be content merely to indicate a few of my impressions and to bring out a few of Ščeglov's salient characteristics. Let it first be said that by no means all he wrote is likely to win consent from the Western reader. This should not surprise. Ščeglov was a member of Soviet society and a member of the Komsomol. It would be unrealistic to pretend that ideological considerations—on both sides—do not at times influence literary judgments. No ultimate literary criterion exists, and there will always be points (presumably as long as "the struggle between the two systems" persists) on which the Western critic will find himself at political and literary odds with his Soviet counterpart. But these differences should not be allowed to obscure the fine qualities of a writer like Ščeglov. And since they are of a predictable nature they will not be dealt with here.

What then are those qualities which in so short a time won Ščeglov a reputation among the more discerning Soviet men of letters?

First, he has not only a deep love of literature and art, which permeates all his writing, but also the ability to make the reader aware of that love with reference to a specific work under review, the ability to act as a bridge of esthetic sensibility between author and reader. All too often Soviet critics treat a review merely as an opportunity to register approval or disapproval. They appear to forget that not all their readers have read the original. Their main object is

to classify. The reader is presented with a list of ideological and artistic merits and defects. He is not invited to share in the emotional experience of reading. He is told how he ought to react. But not to what. He is told if the meal was good or bad. But no one takes the trouble to whet his appetite. This pitfall Ščeglov consistently avoids. He has the capacity—so essential to the critic's art and so admirably exemplified in the late Desmond MacCarthy—of conveying to the reader something of the spirit of the work under review and something of his own enjoyment of that work.

But Ščeglov is no slovenly panegyrist. On the contrary he appears to welcome the most controversial subjects and authors. His slender output includes articles on, for example, Blok, Esenin, Aleksandr Grin, and Vsevolod Ivanov. He attracted attention largely by his ability to debunk. His extensive knowledge of the literatures of different countries and epochs, his experience of or intuitions about life, a sharp eye for detail,⁸ common sense—these assets make him uncommonly quick to spot lapses in literary taste, didactic absurdities, meaningless phrases, exaggerations, half-truths, and falsehoods which others pass over in silence.

A glance at almost any Ščeglov article will furnish examples of his destructive techniques. Here are a few taken from "Žizn' zamečatel'nogo čeloveka"⁹—in general a by no means unsympathetic review of a biography of Borodin written by M. Il'in and E. Segal. Ščeglov's intimate knowledge of the literature of the past and his feeling for intellectual atmosphere make him consistently impatient with the now time-honored practice in Soviet biographies and elsewhere of "revolutionizing" distinguished nineteenth century writers and artists, i.e., of portraying them as though they were entirely obsessed with revolutionary ideas. "Like it or not," he here writes, "out of the great mass of these [nineteenth-century] glorious people, so dear to us, our eternal contemporaries, not so very many squarely embraced the revolutionary struggle."¹⁰ He complains that the authors felt it necessary to emphasize that "Borodin was not a revolutionary, but he always held democratic views." "Is this reservation necessary in the case of a man like Borodin?" he asks. "Does it not implant in the reader's mind the thought that Borodin 'didn't quite make the grade' to some

level of civic conduct, though he strove with might and main to do so?"¹¹

The empty phrase which by some sleight of sound deceives the ear is quickly seized upon by Ščeglov's lucid mind and mercilessly exposed. The authors of the Borodin biography had yielded to the not unnatural temptation of equating Borodin's work as a musician with his work as a chemist: "From every musical image he demanded the same clarity and purity as that which he strove for in his work on a new chemical compound." "Borodin draws together all his rough drafts and sketches into one final unified text ... Thus a chemist, finding a new chemical compound, by crystallization purifies it of all admixtures and impurities." "Just as Borodin the chemist, isolating the crystals, strove to get rid of everything superfluous ... so too Borodin the composer ... eliminated all trivialities from his librettos ..." "Just like the facets in a crystal, the scenes in the opera are constructed not haphazardly but in accordance with the strict laws of symmetry and contrast." The absurdity of these parallelisms, sprinkled at discreet intervals throughout the book, might well escape the inattentive reader. But relentlessly, inexorably Ščeglov gathers them together in one place, and then mildly proceeds: "Not to speak of the fact that this device, repeated so insistently, loses its effectiveness, the very thought itself seems to us to be untrue. Of course Borodin's work represents a very carefully thought out, conscious creative process ... but ... 'the precise laws of symmetry and contrast' cannot be applied so literally to music. Borodin was no Salieri ... It is not for nothing that in one of his letters Borodin remarked that in order to work on Igor' he must 'get back into my musical frame of mind, or creative work is unthinkable.'"¹²

Or again: "Belief in life, in the future of the people and in his own powers is conveyed by the unexpected transition from a slow to a rapid tempo, from the minor to the major key. ... The girls sing a dance song. Here we have his thought about the people which will find within itself the strength to liberate itself. Here we have the folk melodies in which the composer seeks support for his creation." The "programming" of music always gives scope to imagination and wishful thinking. Many would be content to let this pass as a not very happy convention. But "Why," Ščeglov

asks, "is belief in the people conveyed by the transition from a slow to a rapid tempo, and not the other way around? And how are we to understand this mention of folk melodies in which the composer 'seeks support,' why can his 'thought about the people' express itself only through a folk melody or the imitation of one?"¹³ The Borodin article is typical of the unblustering, unpedantic manner in which Ščeglov upsets apple carts.

In his "'Russkij les' Leonida Leonova" Ščeglov faced up to one of Soviet literature's major headaches. The myth, whereby forty years after the Revolution human and social vices must somehow be depicted as "capitalist remnants," has long been a source of irritation and inconvenience to the Soviet writer. Were there not objective conditions in Soviet life which permitted these vices to survive and flourish? "But we need not only confirmation of the existence of capitalist remnants; we need to investigate them, to struggle against them, we need the ability to uncover them in their most modern, in part outwardly 'Soviet' guise."¹⁴

Ščeglov's "Realizm sovremennoj dramy" dealt, among other plays, with Kornejčuk's *Kryl'ja*. *Kryl'ja* involved such controversial issues as the new farm policy and secret police methods. For this reason it was considered extremely daring, and critics had at first been reluctant to handle it. Not, it is reported, until Kruščev attended a performance and applauded demonstratively did critics feel free to praise Kornejčuk. Subsequently it was overpraised. Ščeglov here criticized it precisely for its lack of dramatic daring, showing by detailed analysis that it actually contains no dramatic conflict; "A. Kornejčuk's play, which deals with the most important historical changes in our life, starts ... with the result" (italics his).¹⁵

Ščeglov's "Bez muzykal'nogo soprovoždenija" is a trenchant criticism of Osip Černyj's *Opera Snegina*.¹⁶ Ščeglov is especially severe on Černyj's stereotyped portrayal of Party workers. Noting that most of the latter are even physically alike, he asks: "How is it possible ... to cling to the techniques of oleography in depicting Party people: 'the short and stocky,' with orline gaze; and the rest, all shapes and sizes, whose gazes are beclouded by prejudice and error."¹⁷

These few examples must serve to give some indication of Ščeglov's iconoclastic proclivities. He is above all the

enemy of the empty phrase and the cliché, of the half-truth and the untruth. He is no pioneer in literary criticism. His forte was a clarity of thought which would not allow him to deceive himself. His merit lay in his unwillingness to let others be deceived. If a solid sphere proved to be no more than a bubble, Ščeglov pricked it. His sense of the ridiculous is never far beneath the surface. It was his vocation to say no when most people say yes, and to say yes when most say no; to restore the balance; to set right the record. Mark Ščeglov had two qualities without which his feeling for literature and his lucidity of mind would have remained ineffective: he had courage and integrity. His premature death was indeed a loss.

Notes

1. Literaturnaja Moskva, II (Moskva, 1956), 791-792.
2. Ibid., p. 792.
3. M. Ščeglov, Literaturno-kritičeskie stat'i (Moskva, 370 pages).
4. Novyj mir, 1953, No. 10, pp. 242-251.
5. Novyj mir, 1954, No. 5, pp. 220-241.
6. Literaturnaja Moskva, II, 681-708.
7. Novyj mir, 1953, No. 12, pp. 218-245.
8. See, in particular, his "Vernost' detalez," Literaturno-kritičeskie stat'i, pp. 48-78.
9. Literaturno-kritičeskie stat'i, pp. 301-311.
10. Ibid., p. 306.
11. Ibid., p. 307.
12. Ibid., pp. 302-303.
13. Ibid., p. 309.
14. Novyj mir, 1954, No. 5, p. 240.
15. Literaturnaja Moskva, II, 692.
16. Moscow, 1953.
17. Novyj mir, 1953, No. 10, p. 248.

ENGLISH LOANWORDS IN RUSSIAN

By Morton Benson

Ohio University

The aim of this paper is to describe the English contribution to the vocabulary of modern Russian. This study treats a relatively untouched area of investigation, and therefore must be regarded only as an introductory survey. Several specific topics which are in need of further examination will be pointed out.

The main sources used were general and specialized dictionaries of the contemporary language.¹ It will be shown that English lexical penetration is greater than heretofore could be assumed. Existing histories of Russian have failed to indicate the extent of Anglo-Saxon influence.² The significance of the English element in Russian becomes immediately evident from a breakdown of loanwords listed in the most recent Soviet dictionary devoted to borrowings.³ A count reveals that of the living languages, English is second only to French and is approximately equal to German in the number of words contributed to the lexicon of contemporary Russian.

The first influx of Anglicisms into Russian goes back to the early eighteenth century, when borrowing from the West began in earnest.⁴ Attempts by the Slavophiles to evict these Europeanisms were not successful.⁵ The first loans from English were nautical terms, which together with Dutch borrowings make up a considerable part of the Russian marine vocabulary even today.

A curious instance of Western, particularly American, cultural influence on Russian has been reported in recent years from the Soviet Union.⁶ Some Soviet young people, reacting against the puritanical preachings of Communist morality, have an obsession for American jazz music and slang. These so-called *stiljági* love to use English words such as rock, good-bye, Broadway, etc. Such Anglicisms cannot, of course, be considered loanwords. As yet, they are used only with a narrow social group.

Numerous Anglicisms absorbed by Russian have also entered other European languages. From presently available information, it is often impossible to determine whether a given borrowing has passed into Russian directly or through an intermediary language. The chief possible intermediaries seem to be French and German. As indicated above, these languages and English are the main living sources of loanwords in Russian. (The role of other languages is, of course, not excluded.) The lists of borrowings below will show any French or German forms of corresponding Anglicisms in Russian even though several are clearly not the immediate source of the Russian term. (Cf. French boycottage—Russian bojkót 'boycott,' French bifteck—Russian bifštéks 'beefsteak,' etc.)

Occasionally the position of the stress in a given word may be helpful in determining which language was the immediate source. Since a perusal of entries in Léxin's Slovar' shows that Russian loans from French are usually end-stressed (except for certain endings: -a<-e muet, -or<-eur, etc.),⁷ root-stressed borrowings in Russian can be assumed to be free of French influence. It will be shown, however, that the criterion of stress must be applied with extreme caution.

A difficult group of borrowings in regard to original source language is the nautical terminology. The phonetic closeness of many English and Dutch terms and the frequent simultaneity of their entrance into Russian often render etymologies uncertain. Further special study on the history of Russian nautical terminology should elucidate several doubtful derivations.

Loanwords reflect the cultural impact which one nation has made on another. Borrowings will naturally be concentrated in those spheres of activity where one nation's prestige has been high. Below are listed loanwords in several cultural categories where English influence has been strongest. A section of more important miscellaneous loans is also included. Proper names are generally omitted. No claim is made that these lists are complete. The chief sources of Russian etymologies were the dictionaries of Vasmer and Lexin. (See notes 1 and 3.)

Amusements

- báňžo 'banjo'; Fr. banjo, Ger. Banjo; the Russian /dž/ points to Eng. as the direct source.
- bljuz 'blues' (jazz); Fr. blues, Ger. Blues.
- bridž 'bridge'; Fr. bridge, Ger. Bridge.
- džaz 'jazz'; Fr. jazz, Ger. Jazz; the /dž/ coincides with the Eng. and Ger.
- džíga and žíga 'jig'; Fr. gigue, Ger. Gigue (through Fr.); the form žiga apparently comes from Fr.; final e must often appears in Rus. as -a (see above and fn. 7).
- džóker 'joker' (cards); Fr. joker, Ger. Joker; the /dž/ points to Eng. and Ger.
- fokstrót 'fox trot'; Ger. Foxtrott.
- klúun 'clown'; Fr. 'clown', Ger. Clown.
- klub 'club,' 'clubhouse'; Fr. club, Ger. Klub.
- krossvórd 'crossword.'
- mjuzik-xóll 'music hall'; Fr. music-hall.
- póker 'poker'; Fr. poker, Ger. Poker.
- sketč 'sketch' (theatrical); Fr. sketch, Ger. Sketch.
- tustép 'two-step.'
- vist 'whist'; Fr. whist, Ger. Whist.

Clothing

- brídži (riding) 'breeches.'
- džémper 'jumper'; Fr. jumper, Ger. Jumper.
- džérsi 'jersey'; Fr. jersey.
- frenč 'field-coat'; from a proper name.
- futbólka 'soccer jersey'; cf. futból 'soccer.'
- kovbójka 'cowboy hat'; cf. kovbój 'cowboy.'
- makintóš 'mackintosh'; Fr. mackintosh.
- míčmanka 'petty officer's cap'; cf. míčman 'petty officer' from midshipman.
- pidžák 'pea-jacket', 'jacket.'
- pled 'plaid'; Fr. plaid, Ger. Plaid.
- pulóver 'pull-over'; Fr. pull-over, Ger. Pullover.
- redingót 'riding coat'; the Fr. form of this Anglicism—redin-gote—was apparently the immediate source; Eng. redingote is a back borrowing from Fr.
- smóking 'smoking jacket'; Fr. smoking, Ger. Smoking.
- svíter 'sweater'; Fr. sweater, Ger. Sweater.
- ténnska 'tennis jersey'; cf. ténnis 'tennis';
- trúsiki 'trousers.'
- vel'vét 'velvet.'

Commerce and Economics

- bíznes 'business'; often pejorative.
biznesmén 'businessman'; often pejorative.
bojkót 'boycott'; Fr. boycottage, Ger. Boykott.
bojkotírovat' 'to boycott'; Fr. boycotter, Ger. boykottieren.
bróker 'broker.'
bum 'boom'; Fr. boom.
ček 'check'; Fr. chèque, Ger. Scheck; the Russian /č/ coincides with the Eng.
démping 'dumping'; Fr. dumping, Ger. Dumping.
diskont' 'discount'; possibly from Ger. Diskont.
diskontírovat' 'to discount'; possibly from Ger. diskontieren.
éksport 'export'; possibly from Ger. Export.
éksportírovat' 'to export'; possibly from Fr. exporter or Ger. exportieren.
import 'import'; possibly from Ger. Import.
importírovat' 'to import'; possibly from Fr. importer or Ger. importieren.
invéstor 'investor.'
klíring 'clearing'; Ger. Clearing.
lokáut 'lockout'; Fr. lock-out.
lokautírovat' 'to lock out'; Fr. lock-outer.
pul 'pool.'
ring 'ring' (for cornering market); possibly from Ger. Ring.
skeb 'scab.'
svéjting or svítning 'sweating system.'
trávelersček 'traveler's check.'
tred-juniún 'trade-union.'
trest 'trust'; Fr. trust, Ger. Trust.
údill-strit 'Wall Street'; often pejorative.
údill-stritčik 'Wall Street operator'; pejorative.

Food and Drink

- bekón 'bacon'; Fr. bacon.
bifštéks 'beefsteak'; Fr. bifteck, Ger. Beefsteak and the "folk" variant Bifstück; the latter with ß may have influenced the Rus. form.
džem 'jam.'
džin 'gin'; Ger. Gin.
él' 'ale'; Fr. ale, Ger. Ale.
gréjpfrut 'grapefruit.'
grog 'grog'; Fr. grog, Ger. Grog.
jams 'yam.'
keks 'cake'; Ger. Keks.
koktéjl' 'cocktail'; Fr. cocktail, Ger. Cocktail.

- lenč 'lunch'; Fr. lunch, Ger. Lunch.
ljard 'lard'; possibly from Fr. lard.
pórter 'porter' (ale); Fr. porter, Ger. Porter.
púdding 'pudding'; Fr. pudding, Ger. Pudding.
punš 'punch'; Fr. punch, Ger. Punsch.
ramštéks 'rumpsteak'; Ger. Rumpsteak.
róstbf 'roast beef'; Fr. rosbif, Ger. Roastbeef.
sándvič 'sandwich,' 'sandwich man'; Fr. sandwich.
turnépa 'turnip'; Fr. turnep(s).
víski 'whiskey'; Fr. whiskey, Ger. Whiskey.

Nautical Terminology*

- bims 'beam.'
bot 'boat'; possibly from Dutch boot.
bótdek 'boat deck.'
brakéty 'brackets.'
brekváter 'breakwater.'
brídél 'bridle,' 'span.'
brig 'brig'; possibly from Ger. Brigg.
čák 'chock.'
- číksy 'cheeks,' 'sidepieces.'
- dévejt 'dead weight.'
- déjdvud 'deadwood.'
- díptank 'deep tank' (in hold).
- dok 'dock'; Fr. dock, Ger. Dock; the Rus. form is possibly from Dutch dok.
- dóker 'docker'; Fr. docker.
- drednóut 'dreadnought'; Fr. dreadnought, Ger. Dreadnought.
- drífter 'drifter,' 'drift boat.'
- flor 'floor' (of hull).
- flortímbers 'floortimbers.'
- fútoks 'futtock.'
- kámel 'camel.'
- káter 'cutter,' 'PT-boat'; Fr. cutter and cotre, Ger. Kutter;
 note also admirál'skij káter 'admiral's barge' and
kapitánskij káter 'captain's gig.'
- keč 'ketch'; Fr. ketch.
- két 'cat,' 'catboat.'
- kil' 'keel'; possibly from Dutch kiel or Ger. Kiel.
- kil'blók 'keelblock.'
- kil'son 'keelson.'
- kingstón 'kingston valve.'
- klíper 'clipper'; possibly through Dutch klipper.
- kofferdám 'cofferdam.'
- kókpít 'cockpit.'
- kómings 'coaming.'

kréngel's 'cringle.'

kvaterdék 'quarter-deck.'

lag 'log'; possibly from Dutch log.

lájner (ocean) 'liner.'

míčman 'petty officer' (Sov. navy), 'ensign' (czarist navy);
from midshipman.

monitór 'monitor'; Fr. monitor.

ótterala 'otter trawl.'

píllers 'pillar,' 'stanchion.'

pirs 'pier'; Ger. Pier.

pjátners 'partners.'

planšír 'plank-sheer.'

réjder 'raider.'

ríf 'reef' (part of sail); possibly from Dutch rif.

rúderpis 'rudderpiece.'

skif 'skiff'; Ger. Skiff.

skúter 'scooter.'

slip (shipbuilding) 'slip.'

spináker 'spinnaker.'

starnpóst 'sternpost.'

stem 'stem.'

steps 'step.'

stividór 'stevedore.'

stópor or cepný stópor 'chain stopper.'

strínger 'stringer.'

strop 'strop,' 'strap'; possibly from Dutch strop.

šelf 'shelf.'

šel'terdék 'shelter deck.'

širstrék 'sheer strake.'

tánker 'tanker'; Ger. Tanker.

ténder 'tender'; Fr. tender, Ger. Tender.

top 'top'; possibly from Dutch top.

tópsel' 'topsail'; possibly from Dutch topzejl.

tral 'trawl.'

tráler or tráuler 'trawler.'

trá'l'sčik 'trawler.'

tramp 'tramp' (freighter); Ger. Tramp.

tráneč 'transom.'

trísel' 'trysail.'

vaterlínija 'waterline' (see comments on loanblends below);

possibly from Dutch waterlijn.

vátervejs 'waterway.'

vel'bót 'whaleboat.'

vél'sy 'wales.'

Technology (abridged)

- babbít 'babbitt' (metal.).
bámpér 'bumper' (auto).
baréttér 'barretter' (radio).
bessemerovanie 'bessemerizing'; Fr. bessemérisation, Ger. Bessemerung.
blistr 'blister copper.'
bljum 'bloom' (metal.); Fr. bloom.
búfer 'buffer.'
bul'dózer 'bulldozer'; Fr. bulldozer, Ger. Bulldozer.
bul'dozerfist 'bulldozer-operator.'
búster 'booster engine.'
dérrik 'derrick.'
detéktor 'detector' (radio).
dónka 'donkey engine.'
džígger 'jigger' (ceramics, mining).
džip 'jeep.'
fíder 'feeder' (elec.).
forsúnka 'force pump,' 'sprayer.'
glézer 'glazer' (paper).
gréjder 'grader' (road-const.).
grídlik 'grid leak' (elec.).
kogérer 'coherer' (radio).
kombájn 'combine' (agri.).
kompáund 'compound engine.'
kontéjner 'container.'
konvéjer 'conveyor,' 'assembly line.'
konvértoř 'convertor' (elec., metal.).
kréking or krekírovanie 'cracking' (petrol.); Fr. cracking, Ger. Kracking.
krip 'creap' (metal.).
línter 'linter' (text.).
míksér 'mixer' (metal.).
mjuł 'mule' (text.).
níppel 'nipple,' 'adapter'; possibly from Ger. Nippel.
ofsét 'offset' (print.); Fr. off-set.
pikáp 'pickup truck.'
plúnžer 'plunger.'
puddlingovanie 'puddling' (metal.).
radár 'radar'; Fr. radar, Ger. Radar.
resíver 'receiver' (mach.).
revérser 'reverser' (elec.).
skrájber 'scriber' (carpentry).
skréper 'scraper' (road-const.).
sljab 'slab' (metal.).
sljábíng 'slabbing mill.'

spidómetr 'speedometer.'

stóker (automatic) 'stoker'; Ger. Stoker.

šéping 'shaping machine.'

šunt 'shunt' (elec.).

ténder 'tender' (railroad); Fr. tender, Ger. Tender.

tjúbing 'tubing.'

vateržakét 'water jacket.'

xéder 'header' (agri.).

Miscellaneous

bar 'bar' (for drinks); Fr. bar, Ger. Bar.

bebé 'baby'; the Rus. form is obviously from the Fr. Anglicism bébé, which also entered Ger. as Bébé.

bill' 'bill' (political); Ger. Bill.

bixeviorízm 'behaviorism' (psych.); Fr. behaviorisme, Ger. Behaviorismus.

blef 'bluff'; Fr. bluff, Ger. Bluff.

blefováti 'to bluff'; Fr. bluffer, Ger. bluffen.

bojskáut 'boy scout'; Fr. boy-scout.

bul'dóg 'bulldog'; Fr. bouledogue, Ger. Bulldogge.

búngalo 'bungalow'; Fr. bungalow, Ger. Bungalow.

déndi 'dandy'; Fr. dandy.

dispétcher 'dispatcher.'

dóllar 'dollar'; Fr. dollar, Ger. Dollar.

džentl'mén 'gentleman'; Ger. Gentleman.

džungli 'jungle'; Fr. jungle, Ger. Dschungel.

džut 'jute'; Fr. jute, Ger. Jute.

fil'm 'film'; Fr. film, Ger. Film.

fol'klór 'folklore'; Fr. folk-lore, Ger. Folklore.

fut 'foot' (measure).

gángster 'gangster'; Fr. gangster, Ger. Gangster.

geriskáut 'girl scout.'

interv'jú 'interview'; Fr. interview (a back borrowing; cf. entrevue.), Ger. Interview.

kengurú 'kangaroo'; Fr. kangourou, Ger. Känguruh.

kol'dkrém 'cold cream'; Fr. cold-cream.

kollédž 'college'; Ger. College.

komfírt 'comfort'; Ger. Komfort.

kottédž 'cottage'; Fr. cottage.

kovbój 'cowboy'; Fr. cow-boy.

líder (political) 'leader.'

lift 'lift,' 'elevator'; Ger. Lift.

linčevání 'lynching.'

linčeváti 'to lynch'; Fr. lyncher, Ger. lynchen.

míster 'mister.'

míting (political) 'meeting'; Fr. meeting.

- mitingóvščina 'the holding of many meetings.'
- sejf 'safe'; Ger. Safe.
- skver 'park,' 'public garden'; from square; Fr. square.
- sleng 'slang'; Ger. Slang.
- snájper 'sniper.'
- snájpíng 'sniping.'
- snob 'snob'; Fr. snob, Ger. Snob.
- splin 'spleen' (fig.), 'melancholy'; Fr. spleen, Ger. Spleen.
- stend 'stand.'
- šampún' 'shampoo'; apparently through Fr. schampooing; Ger. Schampoo.
- šrapnél' 'shrapnel'; Fr. shrapnel, Ger. Shrapnell.
- tank 'tank' (military); Ger. Tank.
- tent 'tarpaulin,' 'car-top'; from tent.
- tost 'toast'; Fr. toast, Ger. Toast.
- tramváj 'tramway'; Fr. tramway.
- trápper 'trapper'; Ger. Trapper.
- trollébus 'trolleybus.'
- xoll 'hall,' 'auditorium,' 'waiting room'; Fr. hall.
- xuligán 'hooligan,' 'juvenile delinquent.'
- xuligánit' and xuligánstvoval' 'to act like a hooligan.'
- vaterklozét 'water closet'; Fr. water-closet.
- vokzál 'railroad station'; from Vaux Hall amusement park in London.

English sporting terms in Russian require special comment.⁹ Anglo-Saxon influence has been stronger on Russian sport terminology than on any other part of the vocabulary. The influx of Anglicisms for athletics after World War I became so great that a reaction set in. Certain borrowings, especially for soccer, tennis, and boxing, have given way to Russian equivalents, which are now the prevailing terms. The dislodged Anglicisms are at present obsolete, rare, or sporadic.

In the creation of Russian terms to replace loans, various methods were used.¹⁰ Firstly, the borrowing could be replaced by a Russian synonym, with some extension of the Russian word taking place (in the examples given, the original loanword is given first, followed by the Russian replacement): bek 'back' (soccer)—zaščitnik; fórvard 'forward'—napadájuščij; djus 'deuce' (tennis)—róvno; set 'set'—pártija; klinč 'clinch'—zaxvát; penál'ti 'penalty'—štraf; etc. In several instances, a compound was created to render a monomorphemic Anglicism: šop 'chop' (tennis)—rézanyj udár; fol 'foul'—grúbjia igrá; xuk 'hook' (boxing)—bokový udár.

Secondly, analyzed English terms consisting of more than one morpheme could be rendered by so-called loan translation. Loan translation and extension are extremely close to each other and may be considered variants of the same process—loanshift.¹¹ The basic type of loan translation consists of element by element translation:¹² xavbék 'halfback'—poluzaščitnik; fri kik 'free kick'—svobodnyj udár; sajd step 'side step'—bokovoj šag; etc. When the Russian compound was not the result of an exact calque, but was merely suggested by the concept expressed in the English model, we have loan rendition: békxénd 'backhand'—udár sléva; débl-folt 'double fault'—snóva net; ofsájd 'off side' (soccer)—vne igry, etc. Thirdly, a neologism could be created to render a borrowing: fút-folt 'foot fault'—zašág. Fourthly, an archaism could be resurrected: golkíper 'goalkeeper'—vratár. The last two methods are rare.

In regard to štraf replacing penál'ti and pártija replacing set, we see older, more completely integrated loanwords prevailing over newer ones.

Notwithstanding the reduction of borrowings, Russian sport terminology has retained a large number of Anglicisms. These have already been listed elsewhere.¹³

The essential conclusion to be drawn from the above is that Russian has absorbed numerous Anglicisms, the largest groups thereof being in sports, nautical terminology, and technology. Several loans are obviously of very recent origin: bixeviorízm, bljuz, bul'dózer, džip, radár, úóll-strítčik, etc. They demonstrate that English (including American English) is still influencing the lexicon of Russian.

As evident from the lists, the great majority of English borrowings are nouns. In certain instances, adjectives have been derived from loan nouns in accordance with the general rules of Russian word formation: džaz—džázovyj; kil'—kilevój; xuligán—xuligánskij; etc. Such derivatives were not listed. Other types of suffixation will be illustrated below.

English loanwords, like loanwords in general, vary widely in their degree of assimilation into the overall Russian lexicon. In this respect, four general groups of loan-types might be distinguished. Group I loans are those which have become an integral part of the general, cultured Russian vocabulary. Examples: bifštéks, fil'm, klub, lift, mítинг, tramváj, vokzál, xuligán, etc. Several words of this group are in such frequent use that they have been included in

Josselson's Word Count, i.e., they belong to the 5000 most frequently used words in Russian—klub, mítинг, vokzál.

Group II borrowings consist of technical terms ordinarily not used by the layman. Examples: bixeviorízm, grídlík, kil'son, krip, xéder, etc.

Group III is made up of loans referring to non-Russian cultures. Examples: kollédž, linčevát', míster, trápper, etc. Kollédž can refer only to an English or American college. It never replaces vuz. Míster precedes only an Anglo-Saxon name. Linčevát' is normally used only in reference to the United States. The same action occurring elsewhere would be podvergát' samosúdu. Trápper always denotes a fur trapper in North America. Otherwise, the Russian term oxótnik or zverolóv are used. Tred-junión never conflicts with profsojúz. Additional examples could be cited readily. Certain borrowings, originally of this type, have lost their limited use and have passed or are passing into Group I: biznesmén, gángster, etc.

Group IV loans consist of terms which are now obsolete, rare, or sporadic. The sporting terms mentioned above such as bek, djus, klinč, etc., belong here. Brekváter never did overcome its native competitor volnolóm. Drednóut was always in marginal use by contrast to bronenósec, etc.

Attention should be drawn to those instances where an English word is reproduced in a Russian text without actual borrowing taking place. For instance, in a Soviet periodical the following statement was made in a description of golf:¹⁴ "Odnix bit—tak nazyvaemyx klébov—nužno imet' 13 štuk." 'One must have, to start with, 13 sticks, the so-called clubs.' Here kléb 'club' cannot be considered a loan: it has not yet entered the lexicon of Russian. If, however, golf were to take root in Russia, kléb would of course be assimilated.

Certain Anglicisms in Russian entered English in relatively recent times from a third language. The most obvious words of this type are those coming from languages spoken in areas colonized by the British: búngalo, džut, jams, ken-gurú, etc. Other examples are those terms which passed through English from Romance: detékтор, diskónt, dispétcher, éksport, gréjder, interv'jú, invéstor, kogérer, kollédž, kombájn, konvéjer, konvérтор, skrájber, etc.

Words such as mfčman 'petty officer,' skver (public) 'garden,' stájer 'long distance runner' (from stayer), tent

'car-top,' etc. demonstrate how a semantic shift may take place in the borrowing language.¹⁵ Biznesmén and úóll-strít with their new pejorative connotations also belong here. A semantic shift may indicate the influence of an intermediary language. For example, the meaning of skver (public) 'garden' is similar to that of French square. Flirt 'flirting' coincides in meaning with French flirt and German Flirt.

Klub 'club' is an example of how borrowing may occur despite the existence of a homonym—klub 'puff.'¹⁶

We can now pass to the phonetic and morphological integration of English loans in Russian. One noteworthy phonetic feature of many borrowings is the shift of stress to the ultimate. Examples: babbít, bekón, bifštéks, bixeviorfzm, biznesmén, bul'dóg, fokstrót, fol'klór, interv'jú, kingstón, kol'dkrém, kombájn, kompáund, kottédž, krossvórd, lokáut, pikáp, radár, stividór, vel'vet, vokzál, xuligán, etc. In trolléjbus the shift is to the penult. Penultimate stress seems regular when the last syllable of the original is -er: brekváter, bul'dózer, pulóver.

The reason for the stress shift is not clear. To be sure, many of the words listed above also exist in French. However, the stress shift cannot be attributed simply to filtration through French. Firstly, the shift has occurred in words that definitely did not pass through French: babbít, kombájn, krossvórd, stividór, vel'vet, xuligán, etc. Secondly, numerous direct German loanwords in Russian show a similar shift: abléger 'Ableger,' absác 'Absatz,' incúxt 'Inzucht,' kamertón 'Kámmerton,' kunštjúk 'Künststück,' landšáft 'Lánschaft,' plackárta 'Plätzkarthe,' šlagbaúm 'Schlägbaum,' umláut 'Úmlaut,' etc.

It must be kept in mind that no stress shift takes place in many English and German loanwords (some of which are also known in French): bíznes, búngalo, dédvejt, déndi, dérrik, gréjpfrut, grídlík, invéstor, kíl'son, óterral, róstbfif, snájping, ténnis, yíski, ábris, 'Abriss,' mítteil'špil 'Mittelspiel,' štírbort 'Stéuerbort,' etc.

In accordance with the principle of penultimate stress in English words ending in -er (German -el, -e, -er), there is no shift in words such as džémpér, gángster, káter, lájner, träler, trápper, flígel' 'Flügel,' márka 'Márke,' šíffer 'Schíefen,' etc. (cf. partér from French parterre).

The only conclusion possible at this time is that Russian borrowings from English (and German) often, but not always,

shift the stress to the ultimate. Force of analogy with loans from French may play a role.

The treatment of vowels in borrowings from English can be summarized as follows.¹⁷ The statements for /ə/, /a/-/ah/, /ow/, and /ɔh/ take stress into account. In regard to the other vowels, stress seemed irrelevant for the examples encountered in the material examined.

1. English /i/ usually becomes Russian /i/ (with regular palatalization of the preceding consonant): bíznes, brig, dríftér, klíper, skif, ténnis, víski, vist. The change to /e/ in kréngel's 'cringle' is exceptional.

2. English /iy/ also corresponds to Russian /i/ (with regular softening): bims, číksy, déndi, fíder, grídlík, kil', mítинг, ríf, stividór. The change to /a/ in dónka 'donkey' is morphological and will be discussed below.

3. English /e/ usually corresponds to Russian /e/ (the softening of consonants before /e/ will be treated below): ček, frenč, keč, ofsét, stem, steps, šel'f, ténder. The change to /i/ in svíting is exceptional. The /ej/ in the variant svéting and in déjdvud is a hyper-Anglicism, i.e., it assigns a typical English diphthong to a syllable where no such diphthong exists in the original.¹⁸

4. English /ey/ often becomes /ej/: gréjder, gréjpfrut, kontéjner, konvéjer, réjder, sejf. On the other hand, the change to /e/ also occurs: él', glézer, keks, skréper. The change to /aj/ in stájer 'long distance runner' from stayer is exceptional.

5. English /ae/ and /aeh/ most frequently become Russian /e/: déndi, džem, kèt, kréking, pled, skeb, sleng, stend. The change to /a/ is also possible; bándžo, džaz, jáms, tánker. The variants xéndbol and gándbol 'handball' illustrate the fluctuation between /e/ and /a/.

6. The treatment of English /ə/ is confused. Stressed /ə/ is reflected most frequently by /e/, /a/, or /u/: blef, džémper, trest, bámper, káter, ramštéks, búfer, klub, plúnžer, šunt.

The fate of unstressed /ə/ depends on whether the preceding consonant in Russian is softened or not. If softening does take place, /ə/ becomes Russian /i/: bróker /brók'ir/, džémper /džémp'ir/, káter /kát'ir/. If softening does not take place, the Russian reflex of /ə/ is apparently influenced by the English spelling. The letter e results in /e/ and the letters a and o result in /a/. Examples of /e/:¹⁹ fíder/

fýder/, kontéjner /kantéjner/ (last syl.), réjder /r'ejder/, skúter /skúter/. Examples of /a/: dóllar /dólar/, in-véstor /inv'éstar/, kontéjner /kantéjner/ (1st syl.).²⁰

7. English /a/ and /ah/ often become /o/ in stressed position: dóker, dóllar, gol'f 'golf,' spidómetr, stópor, top. They may sometimes correspond to /a/: čak, lag, ljard. The /a/ often appears in pretonic position (see note 20): koktéjl', kombájn, kompáund, nokáut 'knockout,' nokdáun 'knockdown,' trolléjbus, yokzál.

8. English /ay/ usually becomes /aj/: kombájn, lájner, skrájber, snájper, tajm 'time' (of sporting event). The shift to /i/ in brídel' is exceptional.

9. English /aw/ is usually reflected by /au/: bojskáut, kompáund, lokáut, nokáut, nokdáun, raund 'round.' Other correspondences are sporadic: /ou/ in klóun, /av/ in kovbój, /u/ in trúiski.

10. English /u/ and /uw/ become /u/: bljux, bul'dózer, bum, búster, déjdvud, intervíjú, kengurú, pul, pulóver, xuligán.

11. English /ow/ seems to become /o/ when stressed: bot, bróker, bul'dózer, pulóver, róstbif, smóking, stóker, tost. In póló 'polo' the final unstressed o remains /o/: /póló/ (see note 20). In fol'klór and kol'dkrém English /ow/ is reflected by pretonic /a/.

12. English /ɔy/ becomes /oj/ in kovbój.

13. English /ɔh/ often becomes /o/ when stressed: bul'dóg, flor, kort (tennis) 'court,' kross 'cross country,' xoll. It becomes /a/ in unstressed position: forsúnka, ofsét, ótterral (last syl.). English /ɔh/ sometimes becomes /a/ in stressed position: tral, tráler, vátervejs. The variant tráuler with /au/ should be noted.

This analysis has shown that there is a general tendency to reproduce the phonetic character of the English vowels by using the closest Russian vocalic phonemes. However, many inconsistencies and exceptions exist. The treatment of English /ə/ is confused since there is no clearly corresponding Russian phoneme. Certain English phonemic distinctions such as /i/-/iy/, /ae/-/aeh/, and /u/-/uw/ disappear in Russian.

In general, the vowels occurring in Anglicisms have been assimilated into the phonological system of Russian. Exceptions are the use of atonic /e/ and atonic /o/, as in

pólo. In addition, the diphthongs /ou/ and /au/, as found in kľún and lokáut, do not occur in native Russian words.

The description of the English consonant system is less complex than that of the vowels. The consonantal correspondances are mostly clear and need no special comment. Occasionally English consonants appear softened in Russian when a hard consonant would be expected: pjátners 'partners.' This occurs frequently with /l/: bill', bul'dózer, koktéjl', ljard, slyab, vel'bót, etc. This softening probably results from the influence of West European borrowings with a front (l). English pre-vocalic /w/ is usually rendered as /v/: krossvórd, vateržakéjt, víski, vist, etc. However, the use of /u/ also occurs in úóll-strít. English pre-vocalic /h/ is reproduced by /g/ or /χ/: git 'heat' (sports), kogérer, xoll, xuligán, etc. The variants gándbol and xéndbol also illustrate this vacillation.

English /dʒ/ usually corresponds to Russian /dž/: bándžo, džaz, džémper, džóker, džut. Occasionally Russian has /ž/: vateržakéjt, žokéj 'jockey.' Initial /dž/ does not occur in native Russian words. It has been assimilated easily since the same affricate is found within native Russian compound words (at the juncture of prefix and root): podžárit' 'to roast,' podžáryj 'lean,' podžát' 'to draw in,' podžég 'arson,' etc.²¹

The so-called first Slavic palatalization does operate in derivatives: bul'dógg—bul'dóžij, pidžák—pidžáčnyj.

The most difficult problem regarding consonants is their description as to hardness or softness before e (= /e/ and /i/ < /e/) in English borrowings. Apparently, there exists considerable variation among Russian speakers in regard to softening before such an e.²² Therefore, generalizations must be treated with caution. The velars /g/, /k/, and /χ/ are usually soft before e: gerlskáut /g'erlskáut/, keks /k'eks/, xéder /x'éder/. The labials /b/, /p/, /m/, and /v/ are often soft:²³ bekón /b'ekón/, klíper /k'líp'ir/, biznesmén /b'iznes-mén/, vel'bót /v'el'bót/. The dentals /t/, /d/, /n/, /s/ and the rolled /r/ are often hard: ténnis /ténn'is/, déndi /dénd'i/, bíznes /b'íznes/, séttér 'setter' /séter/, trek 'track' /trek/. However, exceptions are not rare. In the following examples, the consonants before e are soft: káter /kát'ir/, lájner /lájn'ir/, rekórd 'record' /r'ekórt/, sejf /s'ejf/, etc. The lateral /l/ can be soft:²⁴ blef /bl'ef/, lédi 'lady' /l'édi/.²⁴ The variant

lědi should also be noted (the letter ě is also used to indicate hardness in kět and sěr 'sir').

The overall conclusion of this phonological survey is that transfers from English into Russian reproduce the phonetic structure of the original rather closely. Examples of contraction such as míčman, pidžák or planšír are rare.

In regard to morphology, English borrowings are declined like other Russian nouns. Since most English words end in a consonant, the great majority of loan-nouns in Russian are masculine. Normally they have immobile stress. Mobile stress is rare: pidžák, gen. sgn. pidžaká, etc.; káter, nom. pl. katerá, etc. Nouns ending in the soft sign are mostly masculine: bill', él', kil', koktéjl', níppel', šampún', tópsel'. The lone exception encountered was šrapnél', which is feminine. Several nouns have been borrowed as singular in the English plural form, i.e., with the -s ending. Thus, bims nom. sgn., bímsa gen. sg., bímsy nom. pl., etc. Other examples are: bifštéks, kómings, kréngel's, pirs, steps, turnéps, vátervejs.²⁵

Borrowings from English may be combined with Russian morphemes to form so-called hybrid compounds (or loan-blends): džáz + ovýj 'jazz' (adj.), lokaut + írovat' 'to lock out,' miting + óvčina 'the holding of many meetings,' úóll-strít + čik 'Wall Street operator,' vater + línia 'waterline,' xuligán + it' 'to act like a hooligan,' etc. The suffix -ka marks the feminine: basketbolist + ka 'female basketball player.' The loanblend pidžačíško 'miserable jacket' illustrates the fusion of an Anglicism with a pejorative suffix (-iško).

Several well integrated English nouns have generated large families of loanblends. Note, for example, the compounds stemming from tank (military) 'tank': tank-amfibija 'amphibian tank,' tankétnka 'small tank,' tankíst 'tankman,' tank-istrebítel' 'tank chaser,' tankístskij 'tankman' (adj.), tankodostúpnyj 'accessible to tanks,' tankodróm 'tank training (or testing) area,' tankofón 'tank interphone,' tankone-dostúpnyj 'tankproof,' tankoopásnyj 'exposed to tank attack' tankostroénie 'tank building,' tankostroítel'nyj 'tank building' (adj.), tankostroítel'stvo 'tank-building industry,' tankovož-denie 'tank driving,' tánkovyj 'tank' (adj.), protivotánkovyj 'antitank.'

The following blends require special comment:

1. Džúngli is always plural in form. The plural

morpheme i was perhaps added under the influence of débri 'jungle,' 'thicket,' which is also plurale tantum.

2. In forsúnska 'force pump,' 'sprayer' the root fors- seems to have fused with two Russian suffixes: -un (cf. kolún 'chopper,' polzún 'slide bar,' šatún 'connecting rod,' etc.) and -ka (cf. futbólka 'soccer jersey,' letúčka 'leaflet,' maslénka 'oil can,' vjazánka 'bundle,' etc.) In dónka 'donkey engine' the ending is not a phonetic aberration but probably resulted from a blend of donk- with -ka.

3. In trúsíki 'trousers' and tráneč 'transom' the last syllables of the originals were dropped before the suffixation of -iki and -ec.

4. The compound futštók 'measuring (foot) stick (Stock)' is a rare example of the uniting of an English morpheme with a German morpheme. The learned Anglo-Greek compounds tankodróm and tankofón should also be noted here.²⁶

This study has shown that in certain cultural spheres English influence on Russian is noteworthy. It has not yet been established which loanwords passed through an intermediary language. The importation of Anglicisms has not ceased.²⁷

Notes

1. The most important sources for the Russian vocabulary were the following: I. V. Léxin and F. N. Petrov, Slovar' inostrannyx slov (5th edn., Moskva, 1955); D. N. Ušakov, Tolkovyj slovar' russkogo jazyka (4 vols., Moskva, 1935-40); Academy of Sciences, Slovar' russkogo jazyka (1st vol. of 4 to appear, Moskva, 1957); Academy of Sciences, Slovar' sovremenennogo russkogo literaturnogo jazyka (6 vols. of 15 to appear, Moskva, 1950-57); M. Vasmer, Russisches etymologisches Wörterbuch (3 vols., Heidelberg, 1953-58); Bol'saja sovetskaja ènциклопедия, S. I. Vavilov chief ed. (2nd edn., 50 vols., Moskva, 1950-57); B. T. Kolpakov, Eksportno-importnyj slovar' (3 vols., Moskva, 1952-54); A. Ja. Vyšinskij and S. A. Lozonskij, Diplomaticeskij slovar' (2 vols., Moskva, 1948-50); Ju. A. Stepanov et al., Kratkij politexničeskij slovar' (Moskva, 1956); L. I. Callahan, Russian-English Technical and Chemical Dictionary (New York and London, 1947).

The following works served as the basis for the pronunciation, morphology, and orthography of standard Russian: R. I. Avanesov, Russkoe literaturnoe proiznošenie (Moskva,

1955); Academy of Sciences, Grammatika russkogo jazyka (Moskva, 1953), I; S. I. Ožegov and A. B. Sapiro, Orfografičeskij slovar' russkogo jazyka (Moskva, 1958).

The following works were the chief sources for English, French, German and Dutch: Merriam-Webster, New International Dictionary (2nd edn., Springfield, Mass., 1958); A. Dauzat, Dictionnaire étymologique (7th edn., Paris, 1938); J. E. Mansion, Heath's Standard French and English Dictionary (reprinted, 2 vols., Boston, 1953); F. Kluge, Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache, (17th edn., Berlin, 1957); Trübner's deutsches Wörterbuch (8 vols., Berlin 1939-57); R. Perkun, Das deutsche Wort (3rd edn., Heidelberg, 1955); M. J. Koenen and J. Endepols, Verklarend Handwoordenboek der Nederlandse Taal (22nd edn., Groningen, 1948).

2. For example, see A. A. Šaxmatov, Očerk sovremenogo russkogo literaturnogo jazyka (Moskva, 1941), p. 93; W. K. Matthews, The Structure and Development of Russian (Cambridge, 1953), pp. 146-147. E. M. Galkina-Fedoruk et al., Sovremennyj russkij jazyk (Moskva, 1957), p. 51, does point specifically to English loans, but gives only an extremely short list thereof.

3. Lěxin and Petrov, op. cit. Vasmer's Wörterbuch does not give sufficient coverage of very recent borrowings to be helpful in gauging the relative contributions of English and modern German to the lexicon of Russian. It might be noted here that Lěxin and Petrov do not deal adequately with the question of indirect loans.

4. See Galkina-Fedoruk, p. 50. For comments on the past role of Polish as the intermediary between the West and Russian see B. Z. Margarjan, "O slove počta," Voprosy jazykoznanija, 1959, No. 2, pp. 117-118.

5. See, for example, G. Huettl-Worth, Die Bereicherung des russischen Wortschatzes im XVIII Jahrhundert (Vienna, 1956), pp. 69, 77.

6. See New York Times of February 3, 1957, and July 13, 1958.

7. A few examples are: abažuf 'abat-jour,' abonemént 'abonnement,' abordáž 'abordage,' abréžé 'abrégué,' absént 'absinthe,' aféra 'affaire,' akcionér 'actionnaire,' akušér 'accoucheur,' akvarél 'quarelle,' alljúr 'allure,' al'truízm 'altruisme,' avangárd 'avant-garde,' aváns 'avance,' avanscéna 'avant-scene,' avantáz 'avantage,' avantjúra 'aventure,' aviátor 'aviateur,' ažiotáz 'agiotage,' etc.

8. Grateful acknowledgment is made to Professors Harry Keller and Claude Lemieux of the U. S. Naval Academy for their comments on this list of nautical terminology. Professor Keller pointed out several loanwords which,

otherwise, would have gone unrecorded. Their comments indicate the necessity of a special study on nautical terminology that, among other things, would establish which borrowings are obsolete or marginal.

9. For more detail see M. Benson, "English Loan Words in Russian Sport Terminology," American Speech, XXXII, No. 4 (Dec. 1958), pp. 252-259.

10. See Uriel Weinreich, Languages in Contact (New York, 1953), pp. 47-62, and Einar Haugen, "The Analysis of Linguistic Borrowing," Language XXVI, 210-231, for a analyses of interlingual influence on word creation.

11. Haugen, pp. 219-220.

12. See Weinreich, p. 51 for various types of loan translation.

13. See Benson, pp. 253-256.

14. Sportivnaja Žizn' Rossii, No. 10, 1957, p. 21.

15. See also L. A. Bulaxovskij, Vvedenie v jazykoznanie (2nd edn., Moskva, 1954), II, 116-117.

16. See Weinreich, p. 58.

17. The phonemic transcription of English used here is that of George L. Trager and Henry L. Smith, An Outline of English Structure (2nd printing, Washington, D.C., 1956). The transcription records this writer's pronunciation. For the phonemic transcription of Russian, see George L. Trager, "The Phonemes of Russian," Language, X, 334-344.

18. See L. Bloomfield, Language (New York, 1933), p. 449.

19. This atonic /e/ appears only in loanwords. See also Avanesov, op. cit., p. 133. Cf. Trager, "The Phonemes . . .", p. 338.

20. It must be kept in mind that unstressed etymological o becomes /a/ in the standard Moscow pronunciation. Usually this akan'e also takes place in Anglicisms. To be sure, in words felt strongly to be foreign, unstressed /o/ can occur. See Avanesov, p. 123, where, for example, the first syllable of kotéjl' is spelled phonetically as (kok). Cf., however, the entry for koktéjl' in Avanesov and Ožegov, p. 171, where the /a/ pronunciation is indicated. Probably there is some fluctuation among Russian speakers in the pronunciation of foreign unstressed o.

21. See also Avanesov, p. 127.

22. See A. B. Šapiro, "Eště raz o našej orfografii," Russkij jazyk v škole, 1958, No. 4, p. 93, and G. Vinokur,

Russkoe sceničeskoe proiznošenie (Moskva, 1948), pp. 77-78. For the whole problem of softening in foreign words before e, see Avanesov, pp. 130-133, and Avanesov and Ožegov, pp. 540 ff.

23. See also Avanesov, p. 130. Cf. Avanesov and Ožegov, p. 551, where the labials p, f, and m are described as often "semi-palatalized" before e in loanwords.

24. Avanesov, p. 130, points to the possibility of an intermediate (Western European?) l.

25. See also L. A. Bulakovskij, p. 119, where similar examples of singular nouns from German plurals are cited: rózan 'Rose,' klápan 'Klappe,' lókon 'Locke,' etc.

26. See also V. P. Grigor'ev, "Tak nazyvaemye internacional'nye složnye slova v sovremenном russkom jazyke," Voprosy jazykoznanija, No. 1, 1959, pp. 65-78.

27. I should like to express my gratitude to the Ohio University Research Committee, which granted support for this study.

TEACHING RUSSIAN TO THE GIFTED CHILD IN THE JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL

By Norman Balfour Levin

University of North Dakota

This paper discusses techniques which have been used in the teaching of Russian to an accelerated group on the Junior High School level. First, we must recognize the behavior pattern of "the" Junior High School student. He illustrates that quality of mind which is at one and the same time uninhibited, endowed with an infinite amount of energy, volatile, and emotionally immature. Intense curiosity, rapidity in learning, possession of leadership qualities, and adaptability to the unknown may be considered to be among the more pronounced traits of the gifted child. Then, if we combine those behavior characteristics with the salient features of a high aptitude and a keen desire to learn a foreign language, we have the intellectual climate of the accelerated group which comprised the class in Russian established last year at the Junior High level in Grand Forks, North Dakota.

When the University of North Dakota was contacted to set up a language class for the intellectually gifted student, it was decided that Russian would be the language introduced. This choice was made in view of (1) the importance of the knowledge of Russian today both in science and technology, as well as in the field of international relations; and (2) the obvious challenge of the difficulties of the language—phonetic, morphologic and orthographic.

Class composition. The following criteria for the selection of students were given consideration: subjective and objective advice of past and present teachers, and the standard tests of mental ability and language aptitude tests. I was asked to act as consultant and to structure the class.

The class was comprised of 12 girls and 8 boys, ages 12.0 to 14.3, with I.Q.'s ranging from 125 to 150. Socio-economic backgrounds spanned the gamut from unskilled laborers to doctor's children. Students reasons for taking the course were as varied as their backgrounds.

The class met three times a week. Sessions were broken down into a laboratory period, a pattern practice period, and a structural analysis period. The objectives for this class

were five-fold. The students were expected to understand, speak, read, and write elementary Russian, and also to become somewhat familiar with phases of the culture of the Soviet Union.

Methods used in dealing with the target language. Many methods and techniques must constantly be employed in dealing with a target language. Tape, recordings, cognate relationships, and visual aids are among the more familiar techniques projected. Participation in community events, core curriculum, pattern sequence practice, comparative language, and group morale must also be enumerated as being successful introductory and motivational skills. Each contributed to the solution of phonetic, orthographic, and morphological problems. I shall elaborate briefly on some of the methods and techniques employed.

Morale building methods. Morale building methods serve to weld the students into an integrated, purposeful unit. High group morale acts as a motivating force. Since the students knew they were specially chosen, they have immediate prestige (snob prestige albeit) as a group. The music teacher worked with the class on Russian songs, and later they performed as a choral group. Appearances were made on the University of North Dakota TV station, at the high school, and at a P. T. A. meeting. Satisfaction from participation in these events gave further impetus to their high morale. Publicity, modest but effective, in the local paper also contributed to group esprit de corps. These Junior High students were also motivated by an appearance before a university practice teaching class, where they demonstrated their ability to read, write, and do formulaic analysis.

Core curriculum involvement methods. Core curriculum involvement methods are considered, in this particular situation, to be important in contributing to the achievement of a favorable climate, within the school structure itself, for the learning of the Russian language. Special disciplines which co-operate with the students of Russian include science, social studies, music, mathematics, and home economics. The science department asked for reports on Russian scientists and inventions. (Because of the technical nature of some of the books being requested by young people, the public librarian became concerned and questioned their choice of reading matter. She informed me that students gave her a smug smile and the proud information, "I have been chosen to study Russian.") The music department introduced a new unit entitled the History of Russian Music, which was included in the general curriculum of the student body. The students of Russian were able to inform their fellow students of a more correct pronunciation

for the names of composers, symphonies, and operas. Since international relations are so often in the press, current events topics relating to the Soviet Union were frequently discussed. The physical education department included the learning of a Russian folk dance in their Folk Dance Unit. Since the formulaic analysis approach (structural analysis) to grammar was introduced, the mathematics department co-operated by working on a formula unit. Had there been a Home Economics department, it too would have become involved by the introduction of characteristic Russian foods and menu planning.

In a state where less than 15 percent of the schools teach any foreign language at all, this school's entire curriculum, by involving the various departments with our class in Russian, took on a colorful international aspect. Though one is well aware that core curriculum is not usually employed as a technique for the learning of a foreign language, in this instance its use was indicated and effectively carried out.

Phonetic approach. Methods and techniques used to help solve phonetic problems included the use of a language laboratory, which was established. Tapes prepared by native informants, as well as records from commercial companies, were used.

Difficulties of pronunciation—palatalization, stress, pitch, intonation, and consonant clusters—were studied during the laboratory period. Tapes from the Voice of America program, and visual aid films (such as The Stone Flower) acted as illustrations of Russian sounds and gestures.

Orthographic approach. The graphonomy of Russian was covered by the entire class in a week and a half. This learning of orthography was considerably accelerated by the introduction of the extensive use of cognates. Not only were English cognates used, but examples from major Indo-European languages were also employed. The 15 percent of the gifted students who had a foreign language background were utilized as source material. This cognate and comparative language approach enables the student to see linguistic relationships between languages and communicates clearly the idea that Russian is but another of the Indo-European languages.

Structural problems. Under structural problems we have two main approaches; the aural-oral and the formulaic analysis approach. Techniques of the aural-oral approach include the extensive use of pattern practice sequences. In the pattern practice period, conversation was frequently built around daily experiences as well as around pictures, charts and diagrams presented to the students.

As we know, one of the problems in the Junior High is "Just when should grammar be introduced?" Since the

introduction of grammatical concepts has always been a challenge to the educator at this particular level, stress was placed on the techniques designed specifically to strengthen this morphological approach.

Since formula analysis is such an approach, the following procedure may be used. We must assume that the lesson for the day has been completed and the vocabulary reviewed. The student is then assigned the vocabulary and dialogue of the developed lesson for formulaic analysis. He then classifies all morphs (words) into operational symbols. Those words whose morphology is not known to him he classifies in terms of symbols x_1 x_2 x_3 , etc. In class the teacher then guides the student to the known operational definition. The second step then must be to list the symbols. Each given symbol must be explained. Symbols should be original with the student, then standarized by group consent, and thereafter be consistent. The third step in formulaic analysis involves inference and a priori reasoning on the part of the student. He must formula-ize his observations in symbolic terminology, always reducing the formula to the simplest form possible. The gifted student finds the formulaic analysis approach to morphology challenging, thought provoking, exciting, and stimulating. (To further detail this formulaic analysis procedure is not within the scope of this paper.)

Remembering that we are dealing with the gifted child, we are then provided with an excellent opportunity to introduce linguistic terminology (such as phonemes, morphs, allophones, morphophonemic variations, etc.) to the group. Experience has indicated that such students can comprehend the subtleties of the linguistic approach.

Conclusions. Only a short period of time has elapsed since there was marked opposition to the teaching of the Russian language. However, since the students, parents, and school administration are satisfied with the results of the methods and techniques employed this year, next year the course in Russian will be extended down into the elementary school level and up to the high school level as well.

Note

1. St. Mary's Elementary School with classes from 1 to 8,
Sister Dolores Berry, Principal.

THE PRESENT STATUS OF RUSSIAN IN PUBLIC, PRIVATE, AND
PAROCHIAL SCHOOLS OF THE UNITED STATES

(Tabulations of the National Information Center
at Brooklyn College, September 1958 to May 1959)

By Fan Parker

TABLE I

PUBLIC, PRIVATE, AND PAROCHIAL SCHOOLS IN WHICH
RUSSIAN WAS OFFERED IN 1958-59

- Alabama—1 school
Alabama University Military School, Mobile, Alabama
- Alaska—1 school
Anchorage High School, Anchorage, Alaska
- California—35 schools
Arcadia High School, Arcadia, California
South High School, Bakersfield, California
Culver City Unified School Dist., Culver City, California
Academy High School, Lafayette, California
Delano Joint Union High School, Delano, California
Washington Union High School, Fremont, California
Fresno High School, Fresno, California
Grossmont High School, Grossmont, California
Piedmont Junior-Senior High School, Piedmont, California
Polytechnic High School, Riverside, California
Abraham Lincoln High School, San Francisco, California
Polytechnic High School, San Francisco, California
Clairmont High School, San Diego, California
Hoover High School, San Diego, California
Mission Bay High School, San Diego, California
Point Loma High School, San Diego, California
San Diego High School, San Diego, California
San Leandro Senior High School, San Leandro, California
Sonoma Valley Union High School, Sonoma, California
Whittier Union High School, Whittier, California
Freemont High School, Sunnyvale, California
Kern County Union High School, Bakersfield, California
Central Valley High School, Redding, California
Fremont Union High School, San Jose, California
Novato High School, Novato, California
Pasadena High School, Pasadena, California
Salina High School, Salina, California
C. K. McClatchy Senior High School, Sacramento, California
Chadwick School, Rollins Hills, California
Crystal Spring School for Girls, Hillsborough, California
Arcadia Unified School District, Arcadia, California
Russian Parochial School, San Francisco, California
El Rancho High School, Pico Rivera, California
Watsonville Evening School, Watsonville, California
Santa Cruz City Schools, Santa Cruz, California

Colorado—12 schools

Baseline Junior High School, Boulder, Colorado
Boulder Senior High School, Boulder, Colorado
Casey Junior High School, Boulder, Colorado
East High School, Denver, Colorado
Alameda High School, Denver, Colorado
Arvada High School, Arvada, Colorado
Bear Creek High School, Morrison, Colorado
Evergreen High School, Evergreen, Colorado
Golden High School, Golden, Colorado
Jefferson High School, Denver, Colorado
Lakewood High School, Lakewood, Colorado
Wheat Ridge High School, Wheat Ridge, Colorado

Connecticut—13 schools

Andrew Warde High School, Fairfield, Connecticut
Roger Ludlowe High School, Fairfield, Connecticut
Glastonbury High School, Glastonbury, Connecticut
Greenwich High School, Greenwich, Connecticut
Norwich Free Academy, Norwich, Connecticut
Stamford High School, Stamford, Connecticut
Westminster School, Simsbury, Connecticut
New Britain High School, New Britain, Connecticut
Southbury High School, New Britain, Connecticut
Waterford High School, Waterford, Connecticut
Choate School, Wallingford, Connecticut
Hamden Hall Country Day School, Hamden, Connecticut
Hotchkiss School, Lakeville, Connecticut

Delaware—2 schools

Newark Senior High School, Newark, Delaware
Wilmington Public School, Wilmington, Delaware

District of Columbia—4 schools

Eastern High School, Washington, D.C.
Woodrow Wilson High School, Washington, D.C.
St. Albans School, Washington, D.C.
Archbishop Carroll High School, Washington, D.C.

Florida—7 schools

Miami Jackson High School, Miami, Florida
Melbourne High School, Melbourne, Florida
North Miami Senior High School, North Miami, Florida
Hialeah High School, Hialeah, Florida
Fort Lauderdale High School, Fort Lauderdale, Florida
Manatee Junior College, Bradenton, Florida
South Broward High School, Fort Lauderdale, Florida

Georgia—2 schools

Dekalb County System, Decatur, Georgia
Atlanta Public School System, Atlanta, Georgia

Illinois—6 schools

Arlington High School, Arlington Heights, Illinois
Gordon Technical High School, Chicago, Illinois
Proviso High School, Maywood, Illinois
Central Day & Evening High School, Chicago, Illinois
New Trier Township High School, Winnetka, Illinois
Maine Township High School, Desplaines, Illinois

Indiana—2 schools

North Central High School, Indianapolis, Indiana

Indiana—cont.

Culver Military Academy, Culver, Indiana

Kansas—4 schools

Hutchinson Elementary School, Hutchinson, Kansas
Wichita East High School, Wichita, Kansas
Lawrence High School, Lawrence, Kansas
Shawnee Mission High School, Merriam, Kansas

Maryland—3 schools

Friends School of Baltimore, Baltimore, Maryland
Loyola High School, Towson, Maryland
Regina High School, Hyattsville, Maryland

Massachusetts—12 schools

Concord High School, Concord, Massachusetts
Fall River High School, Fall River, Massachusetts
Hopkinton High School, Hopkinton, Massachusetts
Newton High School, Newtonville, Massachusetts
Weston High School, Weston, Massachusetts
The Browne & Nichols School, Cambridge, Massachusetts
Eaglebrook School, Deerfield, Massachusetts
Groton School, Groton, Massachusetts
Phillips Academy, Andover, Massachusetts
Tabor Academy, Marion, Massachusetts
B. M. C. Durfee High School, Fall River, Massachusetts
North Andover High School, North Andover, Massachusetts

Michigan—12 schools

Ann Arbor High School, Ann Arbor, Michigan
Mackenzie High School, Detroit, Michigan
Redford High School, Detroit, Michigan
Cody High School, Detroit, Michigan
Southeastern High School, Detroit, Michigan
Denby High School, Detroit, Michigan
Pershing High School, Detroit, Michigan
Osborn High School, Detroit, Michigan
Central High School, Detroit, Michigan
Ford High School, Detroit, Michigan
Mumford High School, Detroit, Michigan
Central High School, Kalamazoo, Michigan

Minnesota—3 schools

University High School, Minneapolis, Minnesota
Roosevelt High School, Minneapolis, Minnesota
Washburn High School, Minneapolis, Minnesota

Missouri—3 schools

Pembroke Country Day School, Kansas City, Missouri
St. Louis University High School, St. Louis, Missouri
Southwest High School, Kansas City, Missouri

Montana—1 school

Helena High School, Helena, Montana

Nebraska—2 schools

Central High School, Omaha, Nebraska
Brownell Hall, Omaha, Nebraska

New Hampshire—3 schools

St. Paul's School, Concord, New Hampshire
Phillips Exeter Academy, Exeter, New Hampshire
Meeting School, West Rindge, New Hampshire

New Jersey—20 schools

Atlantic City Friends High School, Atlantic City, New Jersey
Arthur L. Johnson High School Regional, Clark, New Jersey
Cranford High School, Cranford, New Jersey
Fair Lawn High School, Fair Lawn, New Jersey
Hackensack High School, Hackensack, New Jersey
Pasack Valley Regional High School, Hillsdale, New Jersey
Passaic Senior High School, Passaic, New Jersey
Pennsville Memorial High School, Pennsville, New Jersey
Roselle Park High School, Roselle Park, New Jersey
Teaneck High School, Teaneck, New Jersey
Tenafly Junior-Senior High School, Tenafly, New Jersey
Thomas Jefferson Junior High School, Fairlawn, New Jersey
Memorial Junior High School, Fairlawn, New Jersey
Englewood School for Boys, Englewood, New Jersey
Miss Fine's School, Princeton, New Jersey
Friends School, Atlantic City, New Jersey
Pingry School, Elizabeth, New Jersey
St. Peter's Preparatory School, Jersey City, New Jersey
St. Alexander Newsky Church, Lakewood, New Jersey
Russian Parochial School, Patterson, New Jersey

New Mexico—8 schools

Albuquerque High School, Albuquerque, New Mexico
Sandia High School, Albuquerque, New Mexico
Aztec High School, Aztec, New Mexico
Farmington High School, Farmington, New Mexico
Los Alamos High School, Los Alamos, New Mexico
Santa Fe High School, Santa Fe, New Mexico
Espanola High School, Espanola, New Mexico
Highland High School, Albuquerque, New Mexico

New York—44 schools

South Colonie Central High School, Albany, New York
Averill Park Central School, Averill Park, New York
Baldwin High School, Baldwin, New York
Berne-Knox Central School, Berne, New York
Bennett High School, Buffalo, New York
Burnt-Hills-Balston Lake Central School, Burnt Hills, New York
Bethlehem Central Senior High School, Delmar, New York
Columbia High School, East Greenbush, New York
Guilderland Central High School, Guilderland Center, New York
Marcellus Central School, Marcellus, New York
Horace Mann School, New York, New York
Rhodes Preparatory School, New York, New York
Stuyvesant High School, New York, New York
Shaker High School, Newtonville, New York
Sleepy Hollow High School, North Tarrytown, New York
Saratoga Springs High School, Saratoga Springs, New York
Linton High School, Schenectady, New York
Mont Pleasant High School, Schenectady, New York
Schalmont Junior-Senior High School, Schenectady, New York
Technical Dept. Mont Pleasant High School, Schenectady, New York
Riodgett Vocational High School, Syracuse, New York
Central High School, Syracuse, New York
Catholic Central High School, Troy, New York
Uniondale High School, Uniondale, New York
Ichabod Crane Central School, Valatio, New York
Whitesboro Central School, Whitesboro, New York

New York—cont.

Williamsville High School, Williamsville, New York
 Long Beach High School, Long Beach, New York
 Charles E. Hughes High School, New York, New York
 Benjamin Junior High School 64, Brooklyn, New York
 Hewlett High School, Hewlett, New York
 Sewannaka High School, Floral Park, New York
 Paul Schreiber High School, Port Washington, New York
 Deveaux School, Niagara Falls, New York
 Harley School, Rochester, New York
 Riverdale Country Day School, New York, New York
 New York Military Academy, Cornwall-on-Hudson, New York
 Fordham Preparatory School, New York, New York
 Park School of Buffalo, Snyder, New York
 St. Iosaph School, Brooklyn, New York
 Russian Parochial School, Brooklyn, New York
 Russian Eastern Orthodox Cathedral, New York, New York
 Russian Parochial School, Nyack, New York
 Bayshore High School, Bayshore, New York

Ohio—13 schools

Hamilton High School, Hamilton, Ohio
 Kent State Union School, Kent, Ohio
 Toledo High School, Toledo, Ohio
 Parma Senior High School, Parma, Ohio
 Mad River Township High School, Mad River, Ohio
 Fairmont High School, Fairmont, Ohio
 Kettering High School, Kettering, Ohio
 Cleveland Public School, Cleveland, Ohio
 The Public Schools, Youngstown, Ohio
 Caraway High School, Sugarcreek, Ohio
 Benedictine High School, Cleveland, Ohio
 Newark Senior High School, Newark, Ohio
 Akron Public Schools, Akron, Ohio

Oregon—7 schools

Cleveland High School, Portland, Oregon
 Madison High School, Portland, Oregon
 Franklin High School, Portland, Oregon
 Washington High School, Portland, Oregon
 Roosevelt High School, Portland, Oregon
 Springfield Junior High School, Springfield, Oregon
 Dallas High School, The Dalles, Oregon

Pennsylvania—38 schools (also see next entry)

Carson Long Institute, New Bloomfield, Pennsylvania
 Boyertown Area High School, Boyertown, Pennsylvania
 Allentown High School, Allentown, Pennsylvania
 Aliquippa High School, Aliquippa, Pennsylvania
 Mercersburg Academy, Mercersburg, Pennsylvania
 Friends Central School, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
 Hill School, Pottstown, Pennsylvania
 Solebury School, New Hope, Pennsylvania
 Saint Veronic High School, Ambridge, Pennsylvania
 Braddock Senior High School, Braddock, Pennsylvania
 Our Lady of the Sacred Heart, Coraopolis, Pennsylvania
 Duquesne High School, Duquesne, Pennsylvania
 Shaler Township High School, Glenshaw, Pennsylvania
 Saint Xavier Academy, Latrobe, Pennsylvania
 Saint Francis De Sales, McKees Rocks, Pennsylvania

Pennsylvania—cont.

Stephen C. Foster School, McKees Rocks, Pennsylvania
Monaca High School, Monaca, Pennsylvania
Blessed Sacrament, Natrona Heights, Pennsylvania
New Kensington High School, New Kensington, Pennsylvania
Taylor Allderdice High School, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
Allegheny High School, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
Knoxville Junior High School, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
Langley High School, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
Liberty School, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
Oliver Senior High School, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
Our Lady of Mercy Academy, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
Saint Mary's High School, Sharpsburg, Pennsylvania
Saint Anselms High School, Swissvale, Pennsylvania
Wilmington Area Joint High School, New Wilmington, Pennsylvania
George School, Bucks County, Pennsylvania
Annunciation High School, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
Saint Adalbert High School, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
Saint Casimir High School, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
Saint Josaphat High School, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
Saint Justin High School, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
South Hills High School, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
Academy High School, Erie, Pennsylvania
Scranton Public School, Scranton, Pennsylvania

A list of the high schools which are participating regularly in daily television lessons in High School Russian over WQED. These schools are located within the ten-county area of western Pennsylvania. Schools utilize the programs variously, sometimes with a teacher present, sometimes not; some during school hours, some after school. The Russian lessons are thirty minutes in length, five times a week. Each lesson is presented live twice daily at 2:30 P.M. and at 3:15 P.M.

Pennsylvania—25 schools (also see previous entry)

Hampton High School, Allison Park, Pennsylvania
Saint Anselm High School, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
Holy Innocents High School, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
Sacred Heart High School, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
Trafford High School, Trafford, Pennsylvania
St. Mary's High School, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
Annunciation High School, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
Divine Providence Academy, Elizabeth, Pennsylvania
Mount Alvernia High School, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
Saint James High School, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
Saint Basil High School, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
Vincentian High School, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
D. T. Watson Home, Leetsdale, Pennsylvania
Clairton High School, Clairton, Pennsylvania
Mount St. Macrina, Uniontown, Pennsylvania
Saint Joseph High School, Natrona, Pennsylvania
Aliquippa High School, Aliquippa, Pennsylvania
Westinghouse High School, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
John M. Conroy Junior High School, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
South High School, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
Saint Wendelein, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
Saint Luke High School, Carnegie, Pennsylvania
Peabody High School, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
Divine Providence Academy, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
Saint Augustine High School, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

- Rhode Island—1 school
 Cranston High School, Cranston, Rhode Island
- South Dakota—1 school
 Huron City Schools Senior High School, Huron, South Dakota
- Tennessee—1 school
 Chattanooga High School, Chattanooga, Tennessee
- Texas—2 schools
 William Adams High School, Alice, Texas
 Sunset High School, Dallas, Texas
- Utah—2 schools
 Davis High School, Kaysville, Utah
 Jordan High School, Sandy, Utah
- Vermont—1 school
 The Putney School, Elm Lea Farm, Putney, Vermont
- Virginia—6 schools
 Chatham Hall, Chatham, Virginia
 Armstrong High School, Richmond, Virginia
 Thomas Jefferson High School, Richmond, Virginia
 John Marshall High School, Richmond, Virginia
 Maggie L. Walker High School, Richmond, Virginia
 Jefferson Senior High School, Roanoke, Virginia
- Washington—10 schools
 Brewster High School, Brewster, Washington
 Roosevelt High School, Seattle, Washington
 Ballard High School, Seattle, Washington
 Garfield High School, Seattle, Washington
 Chief Joseph Junior High School, Richland, Washington
 Stadium High School, Tacoma, Washington
 Bellevue Senior High School, Bellevue, Washington
 Highline High School, Seattle, Washington
 Columbia High School, Richland, Washington
 Sealth High School, Seattle, Washington
- Wisconsin—6 schools
 Nicolet High School, Milwaukee, Wisconsin
 St. Catherine's High School, Racine, Wisconsin
 Wisconsin High School, Madison, Wisconsin
 Madison West High School, Madison, Wisconsin
 University High School, Madison, Wisconsin
 Pulaski High School, Milwaukee, Wisconsin

TABLE II

Numbers of Schools with a Russian Curriculum by States

Alabama	1	Kansas	4
Alaska	1	Maryland	3
California	35	Massachusetts	12
Colorado	12	Michigan	12
Connecticut	13	Minnesota	3
Delaware	2	Missouri	3
District of Columbia	4	Montana	1
Florida	7	Nebraska	2
Georgia	2	New Hampshire	3
Illinois	6	New Jersey	20
Indiana	2	New Mexico	8

New York	44	Texas	2
Ohio	13	Utah	2
Oregon	7	Vermont	1
Pennsylvania	63	Virginia	6
Rhode Island	1	Washington	10
South Dakota	1	Wisconsin	6
Tennessee	1		
		TOTAL	313

* * *

The present situation indicates that much has been accomplished in a short time and the extensive correspondence of the National Information Center testifies to this fact. Russian was offered on the secondary level in 1958-59 in 35 states. However, in 30 percent of the states of the nation no courses in Russian are offered. These are: Arizona, Arkansas, Hawaii, Idaho, Iowa, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Mississippi, Nevada, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Carolina, West Virginia, and Wyoming. Another seventeen states have only one, two, or three high schools in which there is instruction in Russian: Alabama, Alaska, Delaware, Georgia, Indiana, Maryland, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont. On the other hand four states have a total of over 150 high schools teaching Russian: Pennsylvania, New York (not to be confused with New York City where only one high school, Stuyvesant, offers Russian on "experimental" basis), California, and New Jersey.

It is paradoxical, perhaps, that same states with a large number of high schools do not offer Russian, while states with smaller numbers of junior and senior high schools, do offer Russian. For example, Oklahoma with 943 schools, North Carolina with 900 high schools, offer no Russian courses; while Colorado with 354 is offering Russian courses in twelve of its schools, New Hampshire with 97 schools has 3 schools with Russian programs, Oregon with 275 schools has 7 schools teaching Russian and New Mexico with 190 schools has 8 schools with Russian courses.

[The National Information Center on the Status of Russian in U.S. Schools was established at Brooklyn College, under the directorship of Prof. Parker, subsequent to the MLA conference on the teaching of the Russian Language, May 24-25, 1958 (see *SEEJ*, XVI [1958], 241-249). For "Report on the National Information Center on the Status of Russian in Secondary Schools, Preliminary Tabulations, September to December 1958," see *SEEJ*, XVI (New Series, III; 1959), 55-61.—Editor.]

REVIEWS

Robert F. Byrnes. Bibliography of American Publications on East Central Europe, 1945-1957. (Slavic and East European Series, XII.) [Bloomington:] Indiana Univ. Pubs. [1958]. xxx, 213, \$2.50.

As a worker welcomes a new tool to his kit, so do the scholar and teacher welcome bibliographies, their most important tools. And how much greater their delight in a tool for as uncharted a field as East Central Europe. The field is a relatively new one, and not in the United States only, but its growth has been very impressive over the last decade. Yet, the very fact of its rapid growth has made it more inaccessible to the average teacher and student for want of a reliable bibliographical guide. With the present book, however, the situation has been amply remedied.

Professor Byrnes begins the present volume with an excellent account of the state of East Central Europe as a field of scholarly and pedagogical concern. After surveying the history of the field in American academic life since World War I, he gives a very balanced and complete description of what has been accomplished in the last twelve years and—even more important—what remains to be done. He is quite right in stressing the importance of giving the field full and equal status in our college curricula. But this of course means that the scholarly production in the field must be readable and made relevant to our general cultural and political interests. It cannot remain restricted to narrow and pretty undigestible contributions to antiquarian knowledge and pleas for special national or ideological causes. Professor Byrnes' description and analysis of the field's state applies—mutatis mutandis—to the so-called "neglected and obscure areas" of world history and culture. His very stimulating analysis of some of the basic problems of area research and teaching in the United States deserves wide publicity.

The bibliography proper contains 2810 entries, an index of authors, and the list of the periodicals used in its compilation. It is only through constant use that the value—as well as defects—of any bibliography can be established. Unfortunately, this reviewer has not yet had the time and opportunity to use the bibliography extensively. But from all appearance, it is both accurate and complete within the terms of its framework and principles of selection. The main thing the user of a bibliography wants to know from the very start are the principles on which the compilation has been made, how the material is

organized, and what sources have been used. This requirement is explicitly and clearly fulfilled in the present case.

It is somewhat unfair to criticize a book for not doing what its author specifically and consciously did not intend to do. Yet, in a bibliography, such a criticism is perhaps permissible, as the user of the tool should be fully aware of its limitations, as well as possibilities. The few criticisms that follow are suggestions of perfection, but perhaps some of them could be embodied in a second edition. To begin with, the bibliography is restricted (with some exceptions) to "American" contributions. This is taking too narrow an approach. Would it not be more logical to include all materials written in English, regardless of their national origin or place of publication? The list of periodicals used is impressive. But one wonders about occasional omissions. If the New Yorker is included, why not the New York Times Magazine, which is not a newspaper and which has carried numerous important articles dealing with East Central Europe? In spite of the American nature of the bibliography, the Südost Forschungen, for example, are included, but not Osteuropa. One would wish for more consistency in the standards of selection of periodicals. While the organization of the bibliography is clear, consistent, and comprehensive enough, it would be of greater help still if the next edition could include an index by subjects and, possibly, a cross reference listing of periodicals. Finally, and that is only too natural, the entries on East Central Europe in general and on Slavic political, social, cultural problems are far from complete. Perhaps it would be best to bring all the general material together in one separate fascicle which would include entries on the general and common problems of Eastern Europe and Slavdom? Probably, more of this general material will find its place in the forthcoming bibliography on Russia. Teachers, scholars, and students are eagerly awaiting the publication of this essential complement to the present volume.

Professor Byrnes and his assistants deserve our unstinted gratitude and admiration. Theirs was a pioneer effort, but it bears all the hallmarks of excellence. The greatest reward and compliment for the bibliography will be an increase in the attention given to East Central Europe in our college courses, as well as a more active participation of young American scholars in the further development of the field. I feel confident that this will be the case. With such a good tool available to him, there will be no excuse for the college teacher or student to plead ignorance or lack of interest in East Central Europe on the pretext that there is no material available.

Marc Raeff
Clark University

Reuben A. Brower, ed. On Translation. (Harvard Studies in Comparative Literature, 23.) Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1959. xii, 297, \$6.50.

At long last the English-speaking translator and reader of

translations has available a manual of theory and practice of translation. The book is divided into three parts. The first has to do with general principles of translation as exemplified in translating the Bible into various languages (Eugene A. Nida), and then practical notes and inductive generalizations by successful translators into English from Greek (Richard Lattimore, Dudley Fitts), Spanish (Dudley Fitts), Latin (Rollo Humphries), French (Justin O'Brien, Jackson Mathews), German (Edwin and Willa Muir), Russian (Vladimir Nabokov), and Chinese (Achilles Fang). The second section of the book gives articles on theoretical approaches to the problem: the relationship of the translator to the translated (Renato Poggiali), the relationship between meaning and translation (Willard V. Quine), how translations reflect poetic conventions of their day (Reuben A. Brower), eighteenth century English conventions of translation (Douglas Knight), the relationship between the terms "versions," "interpretations," and "performances" (John Hollander), linguistic aspects of translation (Roman Jakobson), and machine translation (Anthony G. Oettinger). The third section of the book, by B. Q. Morgan, is a critical bibliography of works on translation from 46 B.C. to the present, with particular emphasis on recent pronouncements (including not only the usual Western European languages but also Chinese and Russian, Czech, Polish, and Slovak theoretical works on translation).

The great majority of the articles concern the translation of poetry; perhaps the major defect of the book is that insufficient attention is given to problems in the translation of prose. In no sense can any or all the seventeen articles be said to constitute a practical "primer" for the translator; the authors express ideas often at variance and sometimes in polemics with each other. The translators understandably stress the difficulties and thanklessness of their task, the understanding, knowledge, and tact required, and the unavoidable imperfection of the end-product. All agree that a translation must be faithful, but an independent work of art in the receptor language. Articles on how translations necessarily reflect literary conventions of a particular time show why translations of the great works of literature must be done again for each age.

All the articles in the book are to a greater or lesser degree relevant to problems involved in making or judging translations from or into Slavic and East European languages; a number of them are by translators directly concerned with this problem. Vladimir Nabokov's article "The Servile Path" insists that the translator of Puškin's poetry must understand what the words Puškin uses meant to him. Renato Poggiali, in "The Added Artificer," suggests that the translator of poetry must have an "elective affinity" for the work translated. Roman Jakobson's article "On Linguistic Aspects of Translation" argues that "all cognitive experience and its classification is conveyable in any existing language"; however, the "pun, or to use a more erudite, and perhaps more precise term—paronomasia, reigns over poetic art, and whether its rule is absolute or limited, poetry by definition is untranslatable." Anthony G. Oettinger, even in his title "Automatic (Transference, Translation, Remittance, Shunting)" suggests the limits of the possibilities of mechanical translation; its purpose will be utilitarian

in scientific fields, but "not to charm or delight, not to contribute to elegance or beauty."

Each of the articles at least suggests dislike for the necessary imperfections of the result of the translator's labors: "I, too, dislike it," one uses as an epigraph. Adequate translations may be difficult or even impossible, but theory as well as practice and observation shows that there is no hope for individuals to master all languages so as to have the competence to read and properly appreciate in the original the masterpieces of world literature. As Prof. Poggiali puts it: "Literature cannot afford to do without good translators; in given situations, it may well need them even more than good authors.... Especially in modern times, a national literature reveals its power of renewal and revival through the quality and number of its translators. Sometimes it is able to survive only because of their efforts."

J. T. Shaw
Indiana University

George Steiner. Tolstoy or Dostoevsky: An Essay in the Old Criticism. New York: Knopf, 1959. xiv, 354, \$5.75.

Mr. Steiner admittedly approaches the basic texts of Tolstoj and Dostoevskij "by way of translation," and hence his work "can be of no real use to scholars of Russian and to historians of Slavic languages and literatures" (p. 44). Fortunately this is an overstatement. The purpose of the book is to show that only by the "old criticism"—approaching the larger works and the whole mass of the works of authors and including the authors' world views as well as their artistic techniques—can the greatest works and figures of literature be understood. Art and the world view of authors are inseparable, and he thinks Tolstoj and Dostoevskij the greatest of novelists precisely because they have displayed the most comprehensive view of the human situation of all novelists, and with the greatest art.

Mr. Steiner shows an excellent command of criticism and scholarship and of the major masters and works of the European novel. The chief value of his work for the Slavist is in the comparative aspects of the essay, as he illuminatingly compares and contrasts Tolstoj's and Dostoevskij's theory and practice of the novel with that of Western European—especially French and English—and American novelists. He is particularly eloquent and persuasive in his refutations of charges of artlessness against the Russian novelists, by such figures as Matthew Arnold, Henry James, and Ezra Pound, and in his showing the comparative narrowness in view and hence inferiority of art of such figures as Dickens, Balzac, Flaubert, Henry James, Proust, and Thomas Mann.

The book is made up of four chapters. The first compares Tolstoj and Dostoevskij with novelists in the Western European tradition, and finds the main points of similarity with American novelists, especially Hawthorne and Melville. The second chapter discusses Tolstoj as the epic novelist; an analysis of

the opening of Anna Karenina and the concluding parts of Anna Karenina and War and Peace form the central part of a comparison of Tolstoj's world view and art with that of Homer. The third chapter discusses Dostoevskij as the dramatic novelist, with tragic vision comparable to that of Shakespeare and the ancient Greeks. The dramatic quality is shown particularly by an analysis of the opening part and the final confrontation of the four protagonists of The Idiot. The chapter ends with a discussion of Dostoevskij's Underground Man. The final chapter compares the beliefs and mythologies which are behind the art of Tolstoj and Dostoevskij, stressing Tolstoj's pagan-Christian rationalistic religion and Dostoevskij's "surrealistic" mystical, irrational religion presented (Mr. Steiner says) with an explicit orthodoxy but a covert heresy in the novels (see analysis of parts of The Possessed, pp. 308-321). A tour de force and perhaps the most suggestive part of the entire essay is an analysis of the Legend of the Grand Inquisitor as an allegory of a confrontation between Tolstoj and Dostoevskij (pp. 321-343, esp. 328-343).

In his interpretation of Tolstoj and Dostoevskij, Mr. Steiner has utilized the relevant criticisms and primary materials written in or translated into English, French, and German, including works by many Russian critics and thinkers such as Merežkovskij, Šestov, V. Ivanov, and Berdjaev, and his work is, with individual (and often debatable) individual insights, a synthesis of their findings. Thus his main points are familiar to the Slavist. The portions of correspondence, early drafts, and variants of the works that have been translated into languages he reads are utilized for "understanding" rather than judging—for, as he quotes Kenneth Burke, "the main ideal of criticism is to use all that there is to use."

But this is the trouble. Confined by linguistic barriers, Mr. Steiner cannot use the journals, correspondence, notes, drafts—not to speak of criticism and scholarship—which have not been translated. Furthermore, when he abandons the telescope for the microscope to analyze particular passages for style and metaphysics, it turns out that he is analyzing not Tolstoj or Dostoevskij but Aylmer Maude and Constance Garnett. For example, there is a sensitive discussion (pp. 268-276) of the translation of three passages on Andrej and Pierre and the sky in War and Peace; comparison of the translations cited, the original Russian, and Mr. Steiner's analysis shows that his discussion is largely vitiated by errors in translation or unwarranted assumptions from it, involving literary (and agricultural) allusion, tenses, omissions, verbal echoes, and simple inaccuracies. Mr. Steiner's discussion of Russian literary history, his inconsistent transliteration of names and often inaccurate titles of works and even dates betray the hodge-podge nature of the sources he used and his lack of direct knowledge of the original material.

Though his title reflects his awareness that readers tend fiercely to champion either Tolstoj or Dostoevskij to the exclusion of the other, he considers them as equals and both as "titans." He makes his point that anyone interested in the novel must be concerned with Tolstoj and Dostoevskij and that the "old criticism" will have to be invoked for full valuation; he

also inadvertently shows that the critic who would approach close to the work of literary art must read it in the language in which it was written. It is a pity that a book so good could not have been better.

J. T. Shaw
Indiana University

Johannes Holthusen. Studien zur Ästhetik und Poetik des russischen Symbolismus. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht [1957]. 159 pp.

The Russian Symbolists, with the exception of Aleksandr Blok, have not been well studied either in the U.S.S.R. or outside. For this reason Holthusen's studies of Brjusov, Belyj, and Blok are to be greatly appreciated. In Part One, the author gives a solid general account of the Weltanschauung of the Symbolists and their mystical great expectations, and new proofs of some important influences on Russian Symbolists, particularly of Novalis. A more detailed study is found in Part Two, where Holthusen analyzes the style and composition of Brjusov and Blok—the euphony, the creative deformation of semantics, dynamic parallelism, and symbolic images in their poems. He also points out the differences between these two representatives of Russian Symbolism, for instance in their approach to erotic themes: a lover in Brjusov's poems is a kind of cold-blooded student of human passions, while in Blok's poems the lyrical hero seeks oblivion in rapture (p. 103). Striking is Holthusen's discovery that Brjusov's poem V otvet is a paraphrase of Xomjakov's Truženik (pp. 100-101). Finally there is in the book a detailed analysis of Belyj's great novel Peterburg (recently translated into English), which, in my opinion, is worthy of comparison with Joyce's Ulysses. It combines some literary devices of Gogol' and Dostoevskij. Nevertheless, it is a unique masterpiece marked by its rhythmic prose, alliterations, pathos, and irony. Holthusen's excellent study covers all details and the work as a whole. He is right in stating that the main hero of this novel is the city of St. Petersburg. His conclusion is that Belyj, using some fragments of reality which sometimes are brought together only by some metaphoric allusions, is creating a new artistic reality attempting to surpass real life (p. 153).

Some of Holthusen's remarks arouse doubts. He is right in affirming that Dostoevskij's landscapes are poorly described, but Dostoevskij has his own vision of nature: he is a poet of bad weather, of wet snow (Notes from Underground), or of the "special stench" in St. Petersburg during the summer (Crime and Punishment, The Eternal Husband).

Holthusen's book is very typical of the late (autumnal) period of Russian Formalism which experienced its spring, its Sturm und Drang period in the twenties when the young Formalists declared that a literary work is nothing more than the sum of literary devices (priěmy) in it, and when sharp-witted Šklovskij coined new literary terms which provoked lively discussion

(e.g., ostrannenie 'making it strange'). The Communist Party condemned Formalism, but this school continued to flourish outside Russia, where the Formalists limited their studies to detailed and important, though pedantic interpretation of style and genres. Still Deutung cannot exclude Wertung as René Wellek, an admirer of Russian Formalists, justly points out in his Theory of Literature (p. 262). A student of literature may avoid a subjective approach to "literary facts" but he has to take into consideration the evaluation (Wertung) made by others (by literary critics, philosophers). Many attempts have been made to give the general characteristics of Russian Symbolism, the so-called Silver Age of Russian Literature (1895-1917), for instance, by N. Berdjaev (in his disputable but still remarkable Russian Idea), by G. Fedotov (in a collection of his essays Novyi Grad), by G. Florovskyj (Puti russkogo bogoslovija), by W. Weidle, and even others. Finally a vivid discussion of Symbolism was continued in Paris where the brilliant essayist G. Adamovich discussed all pro's and contra's of Russian Symbolism. This kind of evaluation is ignored not only by Holthusen but also by other Neo-Formalists. Nevertheless, this work contributes much to the studies of Russian Symbolism.

George Ivask
University of Kansas

Georgij Ivanov. 1943-1958 stixi. Introd. Roman Gul'. New York: Novyj Žurnal, 1958. 112 pp., \$2.00.

Georgij Ivanov started in 1912 as an Ego-Futurist, but soon became a secondary Acmeist and as such is still known to Soviet critics, who ignore the fact that he became a major poet in exile. Even more than that, Ivanov may eventually be considered the greatest Russian poet of the 1940-50's. He died on August 26, 1958, before he could see this last book of his, which is an event of great importance in Russian poetry and contains Ivanov's best and maturest work. It includes the previously published Portret bez sxodstva (Paris: "Rifma," 1950), with only a few poems omitted, but for the most part the book consists of poems published in 1950-58 in Novyi Žurnal (usually under the title "Dnevnik") and now appearing with only a few changes, such as new arrangements of stanzas or addition of epigraphs and dedications.

Georgij Ivanov's historical importance lies not only in his bringing to a logical conclusion many traditions of the period of Aleksandr Blok—sometimes known as the "Silver Age" of Russian poetry—but also in his providing the best possible realization of the ideals of the most important group of Russian émigré poets, the so-called parižskaja nota. The ever-present undercurrent of Ivanov's poetry is, not unexpectedly, the loss of Russia and of St. Petersburg in particular, and this leads the poet to the attitude which has been often called "nihilism" but is actually the theme of the failure of Art and Beauty to save this world from degradation and death. Ivanov is a poet of contrasts and contradictions, and one of these is his mixing of traditional

technique and modern vision. However, he is a traditionalist only up to a point, and elements of surrealism can be found in some of his best poems. Many poems are written in Ivanov's favorite manner of mumbling and muttering to oneself (reminiscent of V. Rozanov), using colloquialisms, flaunting a kind of *je-m'en-foutisme* and playing with ideas and verbal clichés; others are essentially melodic and often full of strange beauty, almost unbearable in its intensity. Ivanov is unique in his combining of simplicity and brevity with elusiveness, of modern consciousness with a nostalgia for the things past, and of acid beauty with *épatage*.

Unfortunately, Russian literature in exile is not likely to become the object of study until a time when materials will be hard to get, many important facts will be forgotten, and historians of literature will be sorry for their neglect of this field in the past.

Vladimir Markov
University of California (Los Angeles)

Yar Slavutych. Ivan Franko i Rosija. (Ukrainian Free Academy of Sciences, Series: Literature, No. 5.) Winnipeg, 1959. 27 pp.

Voluminous publication of Ivan Franko's writings, such as the recent edition of his works in twenty volumes, testifies to his popularity in the Ukraine. However, although many recent monographs deal with Franko's literary legacy and his socio-economic philosophy, they treat inadequately his relation to Russia.

Yar Slavutych gives ample evidence of censoring and of biased interpretation of Franko in Soviet writings. He points out that, although Franko subscribed to socialist ideals of "progress, spreading of education, knowledge, criticism, and individual and national freedom," at the same time he rebuked and rejected "the religion based on dogma of hatred and class struggle"; that, although he respected outstanding Russian writers, he condemned "the Moscow state with its police and officialdom oppressing all free thought"; finally, that despite his familiarity with Russian literature, it did not influence his prose and poetry. The post-Stalinist era has brought a reinterpretation of Franko's literary works, and noted critics such as E. Kyryluk and O. Biletsky assert his great individuality and that he was not "a Ukrainian variant of Russian Revolutionary-Democratic literature." But this rehabilitation of the artist does not concern the philosopher and the champion of liberty. As a publicist, Franko condemned tsarist despotism as "a prison of nations." He also foresaw disastrous consequences of Communism where the "free will and private opinion of every individual must atrophy and disappear if the state finds them harmful and unnecessary. Training aiming to educate not free individuals but only useful citizens would become a deadly regimentation . . ." (pp. 19-20, quoting from Franko's "What is Progress," written in 1903). Thus, Franko's attitude toward

Russia and the issues which it raises not only for Eastern Europe but also for all humanity is important if one is to understand his full stature. In this respect, the short study by Yar Slavutych contributes to a fuller understanding of "the father of modern Ukrainian literature, and the sculptor of the modern Ukrainian national spirit."

The study contains a summary in English.

V. N. Bandera
University of California (Berkeley)

Symon Braha. Mickiewicz i belaruskaja plyn' pol'skaje literatury. New York: Whiteruthenian Institute of Arts and Science, 1957. 32 pp., \$1.00.

In this booklet, Mr. Braha discusses the Whiteruthenian elements in the works of Adam Mickiewicz and his relationship to Belarus', the country where the greatest Polish poet was actually born. Mr. Braha is quite right when he points out that the plot of Dziady was definitely influenced by an old Whiteruthenian rite connected with commemoration of the souls of the dead. In Pan Tadeusz, the poet's most outstanding work, the description of Whiteruthenian landscapes occupies a considerable place. Furthermore, Mickiewicz used Whiteruthenian vocabulary and syntax in his writings, and wrote even his surname with the Whiteruthenian suffix -ic(-ič) instead of the expected -ic in Polish. The problem arises, however, whether the poet did it deliberately. Mr. Braha does not solve this problem, although he hints at its solution.

Mr. Braha comes to the conclusion that under the celebrated expression "Litwo, ojczyzno moja" Mickiewicz meant not Lithuania proper, but Belarus'—his native country which once belonged to the Lithuanian kingdom. "I frequently long for Lithuania and dream all the time of Navahradak and Tuhanavičy," the poet wrote once in a letter from Paris. The fact that both towns mentioned are located not in Lithuania but in Belarus' fully supports Mr. Braha's conclusion.

Yar Slavutych
U.S. Army Language School

Charles Morley, ed. and tr. Portrait of America: Letters of Henry Sienkiewicz. New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1959. xix, 300, \$5.00.

This publication is indeed welcome, for the American reader who has read Mrs. Trollope's and Dickens' American travel accounts—I mention these because they are the closest in time to Sienkiewicz's Letters from America—should also know the impressions of the Polish novelist. Although Dickens' American Notes certainly were a guide for Sienkiewicz, his impressions are, in many instances, different from those of his

English predecessors. This is only natural, since the approach of a young Polish writer toward America should be different from that of English visitors.

Besides, there was also a difference in time. Dickens saw America in 1850, whereas Sienkiewicz visited this country in the seventies; some twenty-five years in the life and development of the "New World"—if one does not say the "Young World"—did not pass without extensive changes. On the other hand, these Letters reveal that many modern American customs were already well-established traditions in Sienkiewicz's time, as I have stressed elsewhere (Bits of Table Talk on Pushkin, Mickiewicz, Goethe, Turgenev and Sienkiewicz [The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1956], pp. 220-256, and especially in my essays which will appear in Belgium and Holland.) Besides, Sienkiewicz's account is valuable not only because of its historical content but also its colorfulness.

Finally, there is also another difference between Sienkiewicz's two volumes (in the original, his Letters make up two large volumes) and Dickens' rather short Notes: his stay in America was much longer, and geographically, he saw much more than Dickens. From this point of view, Sienkiewicz's Letters are more comparable to Mrs. Trollope's North America. Hence, because of the geographical vastness of Sienkiewicz's description, the American reader is likely to find, in Letters from America, details concerning his own region. Within the bounds permitted by the decision to give an abbreviated English version of Sienkiewicz's two volumes, the translator made, I think, a good choice and provided the chapters of his book with titles which more or less correspond to the most important items discussed by Sienkiewicz in his "sketches" or "letters." I am sincere in this appraisal, the more so that when a year ago I wrote an essay which includes a brief presentation of Sienkiewicz's Letters, I made a similar selection of topics.

I have not read the whole volume of Professor Morley's translation; I have simply compared some passages here and there with the original. It seems to me that in general it is a very successful rendering of the Polish text, a free one presented in excellent English, from time to time giving the impression of being rather an adaptation. I would perhaps object to the omission of some of Sienkiewicz's denominations (for instance, the replacing of the Polish writer's "fable of La Fontaine" by "myth," or the translation into English of the French "Egalité, Fraternité et cetera")—but these are of course minor details.

Professor Morley, as he says in his Preface, based his translation on the text of the Letters published in Poland by Julian Krzyżanowski in his recent complete edition of Sienkiewicz's works. Professor Morley not only used it as a base but sometimes corrected it. Such is the case with the description of New York churches in the chapter "Sojourn in New York." Professor Krzyżanowski changed the following correct sentence by Sienkiewicz (I am giving it in a literal English translation): "Yonder is a church in which people praise the Lord bellowing like calves, whereas in another they tremble, and in yet another they pray in the Catholic manner." In Professor

Krzyżanowski's edition this sentence reads: "Yonder is a church in which people praise the Lord bellowing like calves, whereas in another they neigh like horses, and in yet another they pray in the Catholic manner" (Henryk Sienkiewicz, *Dzieła*, ed. Julian Krzyżanowski [Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, 1950], XLI, 82). In his editor's remarks, Professor Krzyżanowski stated that taking into consideration the many errors which appear in various editions of Sienkiewicz's Letters he was obliged to correct them, and that often he had to be guided only by "common sense and the knowledge of the habits of Sienkiewicz the writer," and added that on this basis, in the passage concerning the churches where people "tremble" (in Polish, "drżą"), this verb has been replaced by "neigh" (in Polish, "rzą")—by analogy with the bellowing in other churches," as Professor Krzyżanowski emphasizes (XLII, 342). Professor Morley showed that he understood Sienkiewicz's metaphors and allusions and trusted Sienkiewicz's knowledge of various American faiths and sects more than he did Professor Krzyżanowski's knowledge of Sienkiewicz's habits as a writer: he at once realized that Sienkiewicz had in mind the Shakers, and hence we read in Morley's version: "they shake and tremble."

Professor Morley's Introduction, despite its brevity, is probably an appropriate one—practically, his ten pages give the essentials of Sienkiewicz's trip to America. I personally think, however, that a general presentation of this Polish author—so immensely popular in the whole world, and particularly in America, some fifty years ago but now almost entirely forgotten—would have been not only useful but appropriate on this occasion. I believe that a larger and more ample introduction, dealing with Sienkiewicz the writer and not merely the author of Letters from America, would not only be useful for the readers of this book but would certainly be to the advantage of the book itself, to the advantage of the publisher too (I mention this having in mind that perhaps technical considerations so common nowadays may have imposed limitations on Professor Morley's efforts). In any case, I do not share Professor Morley's opinion that "as the author of the Nobel Prize-winning novel Quo Vadis?, Henry Sienkiewicz needs no introduction to Americans." Yes, there was a filmed version of Quo Vadis? several years ago, and there still, I believe, exists a very good restaurant in New York under the name of Quo Vadis?, but these doors do not lead to Sienkiewicz's, but to some other art. Even within the frame of this reduced Introduction, however, Sienkiewicz the traveler, Sienkiewicz the hunter, who looked at the American flora and fauna with the eyes of an explorer of nature, Sienkiewicz the future author of Letters from Africa and of Desert and Wilderness, should have been, if not thoroughly examined, at least mentioned. The same would be true also as far as the effect of Sienkiewicz's American travel on his later art is concerned. With these problems is also connected something else; namely, a comparison of Sienkiewicz's Letters from America with Mrs. Trollope's North America and Dickens' American Notes would be interesting. Sienkiewicz, as I mentioned, saw more than did Dickens, who visited only a few cities and concerned himself mostly with several civic and

public institutions, whereas Sienkiewicz traveled through the whole country, even more extensively than Mrs. Trollope, and described nature in detail. I mentioned changes, along with firmly established traditions, in American life. Changes are particularly striking in the realm of American flora and fauna. Many American readers of Professor Morley's translation will probably be amazed to see on those pages the immense forests and so many formerly living wild animals, and probably also birds, which have since disappeared, although the original full Polish text is even richer in this respect. This, I think, should have been stressed, the more so that indeed Sienkiewicz the author-hunter and author-traveler has his place among writers like Turgenev, Aksakov, Tolstoj, Weyssenhoff, Kipling, and finally the two who used to be so very popular among European youth, James Fenimore Cooper and Thomas Mayne Reid. Should I not add, with a smile, Daudet's "intrepid" Tartarin de Tarascon?

The book is very nicely published. De Pol's woodcut is quite impressive, and the subject index will be very useful to the reader. I was also happy to learn from the Preface that we have in Professor Charles Morley a historian of Russia and Poland who devotes his time to reading and writing in the field of Polish belles-lettres.

At the end of this short note, I should like to extend my congratulations to the translator, the editor, and the publisher.

Waclaw Lednicki
University of California (Berkeley)

George Y. Shevelov and Fred Holling, eds., A Reader in the History of the Eastern Slavic Languages: Russian, Belorussian, Ukrainian. New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1958. viii, 81, \$2.75.

This book contains sixty short sample texts from Eastern Slavic territory, divided into the following groups: Old Russian (11th-13th c., 15 texts), Middle Russian (14th-17th c., 22 texts), Middle Belorussian (15th-17th c., 5 texts) and Middle Ukrainian (14th-early 18th c., 18 texts). All of the texts are photostatic reproductions from various chrestomathies, books, and periodicals. Exact page references to these sources would have been helpful in some cases (for example, the selection from the Pskov Chronicle can be found in the source only by the roundabout process of looking up personal and place names in the index). The reproductions are in most cases clear, although in one or two instances (e.g., texts 44, 46) a dark, heavy original has resulted in a smudged although still legible copy. The texts themselves are followed by a list of sources and a brief glossary.

Teachers and students will find this Reader a useful aid, particularly since it contains a number of Ukrainian and Belorussian texts not easily available elsewhere; these texts give the Reader an advantage in comparison with the far more voluminous but almost exclusively Russian chrestomathy of

Obnorskij and Barxudarov, for example. In fact, one wonders if it might not have been more useful to omit much of the standard and easily obtainable Russian material altogether, in order to make room for more Ukrainian and (especially) Belorussian texts. One might also question the necessity of including photographs of one of the Novgorod birchbark letters and of an inscription on a wooden bowl (texts 8 and 11), particularly since the printed-letter transliteration is not reproduced from the source and the objects themselves are given only in a 2 1/2 x reduction that students will surely have trouble deciphering.

The Reader should prove of most value to students of the history of Eastern Slavic at a few large universities, where the texts have only to serve as illustrations to the lectures of such authorities in this field as Professor Shevelov. For the many less fortunate students working elsewhere, however, it might have been desirable to include a more adequate apparatus for reading the excerpts themselves. It would have been a relatively simple matter, for example, to provide each text with a few lines of introduction concerning its origin, history, editions, and perhaps even its linguistic peculiarities. Except for the list of sources, there is no bibliographical material at all, although it might have been interesting, for example, for the student to be able to follow the lively trans-Atlantic controversy concerning the birchbark letter from Gostjata to Vasilij. There are no annotations to the texts, and even the footnotes of the original sources have been edited out, which not only leaves odd-looking blanks in the texts themselves but also occasionally (and more seriously) eliminates information of linguistic and textological importance. For example, the form meži in the first Novgorod Chronicle is given in the Reader (p. 8) without comment, but a check with the 1950 Soviet Academy edition used as source reveals (p. 27) that the final i was reworked from an original ju. The form po Rosi from the Poučenie of Vladimir Monomax is not commented upon in the Reader (p. 5), but the Academy edition of the Laurentian Chronicle edited by Lixačev et al. in 1950 shows (II, 199) that po Rosi is only a conjecture of Miklosich, whereas the manuscript itself has po Rovi. If students are capable of working with Old Russian texts, should they not be allowed to read the excerpts in their natural complexity? Such annotations would be particularly desirable in view of the fact that some 50% of the sources excerpted are not available to the average American student.

Analogous objections might be raised concerning the glossary, which "comprises words which are not identifiable on the basis of Modern Russian, Belorussian, or Ukrainian" (p. iii). A brief check-up with Vol. I of Ušakov's dictionary showed that many words in the Reader's glossary are identical or very similar in both form and meaning with words still used (sometimes archaically, it is true) in modern Russian, e.g., bla-gočinie, blagočinno, bran², vol'no, glagol, griv'na, deло, delatel', život, žito, žnivo, žolner, zelo (given as both zelo and zělo in the glossary), zlodejstvo, znamenitij, indikt. Since few students will approach the history of Eastern Slavic without a good background in modern Russian, Church Slavic, or both, (and because good Russian dictionaries are available everywhere) such words are superfluous. On the other hand,

since few students or teachers are as well versed in Ukrainian and Belorussian as the authors (and because good dictionaries for these languages are rare), it might have been of value to include more comprehensive glosses of the texts in these languages, which would explain such forms as ssermugu, wygwoda, pūgmi, lissi, nerownagmi, ges, that occur in a Middle Ukrainian song (p. 54) and which are not to be found in at least two Ukrainian-English dictionaries (Andrusyshen [Toronto, 1957]; M. L. Podvesko [(n. p.), 1954]). Particularly difficult texts, especially when printed in the Roman alphabet, such as the Middle Belorussian Al-Kitab (p. 43) would require even more detailed explanation of such forms as 'enkelej, tevarišu, sūdnahu, 'abadva, Na 'ire, etc.

However, regardless of such relatively minor objections as those mentioned above, this can be considered a useful and timely book, one which will be welcomed by all serious workers in the historical analysis of Eastern Slavic.

Gerta Hüttl Worth
University of California (Los Angeles)

H. H. Bielfeldt, ed. Rückläufiges Wörterbuch der russischen Sprache der Gegenwart. (Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Slawistik.) Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1958. iv, 392, DM 19.50.

The materials for this dictionary were collected and arranged in reverse alphabetical order by students of the Institut für Slawistik of the University of Berlin (East Berlin), under the direction of K. and E. Günther and with the assistance of A. Eckelt. The dictionary consists of some 80,000 words of modern literary Russian, excerpted from the dictionaries of Ušakov and Ožegov. Supplementary material was taken from the first volume of the Grammatika russkogo jazyka published by the Soviet Academy (M., 1953) and from the Orfografičeskii slovar' (M., 1957). Some of the headwords in Ušakov were omitted; such omissions include past passive participles, verbs in -sja (although there are nevertheless thirty-five pages of such words given) and dialectal forms. The standard procedure is followed of giving only a portion of such practically inexhaustible derivational types as nouns with diminutive suffixes, abstracts in -ost', etc. A large number of foreign words are quoted (cf. the list of abstract nouns in -izm on pp. 186-188), as are many Soviet abbreviations (e. g., fizkul'turnica, aviabomba, politučeba). The stress is marked on all words. Homonyms are differentiated by numbers. The words are printed in four columns, without any translations or explanations.

The specific purpose of this dictionary is to help the student of Russian acquire a basic knowledge of word formation (suffixation, prefixation, composition) which will, by grouping together root and suffixal morphemes, make their general meanings apparent and thus aid in vocabulary building. However, the dictionary will also be a most useful time-saver for

advanced Slavists as well, who, when working in Russian morphology, have until now had to search laboriously through traditionally arranged dictionaries for examples of various derivative suffixes or, say, to find out which prefixes a particular verb can take.

Useful as this dictionary is in many ways, it represents in one way a most regrettable waste of effort. Because one of the always astonishing and by no means infrequent coincidences in scholarly publishing, this Rückläufiges Wörterbuch has appeared at the same time, and even in the same city, as an almost identical dictionary under the direction of Max Vasmer (Russisches rückläufiges Wörterbuch, compiled by R. Greve and B. Kroesche, Osteuropa-Institut an der Freien Universität Berlin, Slavistische Veröffentlichungen, Vol. xiii, Fascicle 1, Berlin-Wiesbaden, 1957; Fascicle 2, 1958). Such a deplorable duplication of effort ought to be avoided; if this is not possible by co-operation among scholars themselves, then it might be accomplished through announcements in the specialized periodicals, such as the recently-introduced rubric "Nad čem rabotajut učenyе" in Voprosy jazykoznanija. The reverse-order dictionary of Vasmer is much more voluminous: a total of six fascicles of 240 pages each are planned. In addition to Ušakov's materials, Vasmer has utilized the materials of Dal', Tolkovyj slovar' živogo velikorusskogo jazyka, and several specialized military and technical dictionaries. It might be questioned, however, whether this greater volume really enhances the value of Vasmer's work compared to Bielfeldt's. Both Ušakov and Ožegov (Bielfeldt's main sources) are normative dictionaries of contemporary standard Russian, which lends a certain systematic unity to Bielfeldt's work. In Vasmer's dictionary, on the other hand, the presence of archaic, dialectal, or even purely hypothetical forms from Dal' might make it hard to say in just what type of Russian a particular suffix occurs. Another disadvantage of Vasmer's work is that the stress is not indicated.

In conclusion, it can be said that the appearance of this Rückläufiges Wörterbuch provides the world of Slavists with a novel and useful instrument.

Gerta Hüttl Worth
University of California (Los Angeles)

V. Tschebotarioff-Bill, ed. The Russian People: A Reader on Their History and Culture. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1959. xii, 139, \$4.00.

According to the Preface, this book is intended for second- or third-year students of Russian, its double goal being to increase the student's proficiency in the language and to introduce him to the forces that have shaped the historical development of the Russian people. To fulfill this objective, Professor Tschebotarioff has selected significant passages from Russian scholars and organized them into a connected whole which takes us, in 24 brief chapters, from the Kiev to the Soviet period.

Two of these chapters (20 and 23) are the editor's original contribution. Chapter 21 is not accounted for.

Sources are given at the end of the book, but with no more specific reference than general titles. Indeed, it would have been difficult to provide more detailed data, since the editor has ranged widely for her inspiration, often combining material from several authors into one chapter, or drawing on scattered material from one author. Thus, the source for Chapter 8 is given as Ključevskij, Kurs russkoj istorij, Vol. II. A brief check shows that Chapters 26, 28, 27, 31, 32, 36, 37 (?), 30, and 29, in that order, have been utilized. Chapter 13 takes disjecta membra from Ancyferov's Duša Peterburga (pp. 26 and 31), Grabar, Istoriya russkogo iskusstva (Vol. III, Chapters 1, 2, 12, and 21, among others) and Belinskij's Peterburg i Moskva (passim). The editor states that her own contribution, apart from the two chapters mentioned, "is limited to a few sentences intended to bridge gaps . . . and to assure continuity of narrative" (p. v). This seems to be an understatement. It omits the considerable simplification, rearrangement, and compression to which the various authors have been subjected. Since they wrote for Russians, with no thought of language-teachers' problems, such editing was no doubt indispensable. To take a typical example, the excerpt from Mel'nikov-Pečerskij (V lesax, Ch. 1) given on page 27 could certainly not have been used in the original version. The same applies to many of the writers to whose "brilliant mastery" of the Russian language the editor refers. Unfortunately, the changes suffered frequently involve loss of the brilliance that partly determined their inclusion. Worse, the author's facts or ideas are sometimes altered in the process. This is the case, for instance, for the sentence beginning: "K 16 veku na severe . . ." (p. 21), which distorts the Ključevskij original (Kurs, Vol. II, Ch. 34, p. 305, in the 1918 edition). A third consequence is that some chapters produce a patchwork effect, as in Chapter 6, and especially 13, in which Ancyferov's very distinctive style does not blend too happily with Grabar's or Belinskij's.

The choice of authors and material is excellent, though some readers might judge that Ključevskij has been too heavily drawn upon. The student is presented with an intelligent, well-focussed summary and interpretation of the main facts in the material and spiritual development of Russia. However, since most fields of Russian nineteenth century culture are dealt with at length, one could wish that the philosophies of history and religion that loom so large during that period had been given more space. Scientific achievements would have deserved mention. In the chapter on painting, Fedotov is omitted, though it is conceivably more important to know about this commentator on Russian life than to be given the names of some minor foreign artists in the first paragraph.

Accent-markings are applied throughout. Unfortunately, wrong accentuations are disconcertingly numerous. They are particularly frequent for historical and geographical terms. A few of the most remarkable: Kolomná (18), Suzdál' and its adjectives (17, 18, 27, 32, etc.), Ivan Kalítá (33, 42, 43), Uglič' (42), Saloníki (127), Balakrév (94), for: Kolómnu, Súzdal', Kalitá, Úglič', Salóniki, Balákirev. There is also an impressive number of errors in the stress and spelling of common

words. A very few samples: ikónopis' (14, 23), létópisnoe (8, 11), preémnik (31, 32, 33, etc), okrájna (38, 41, etc), pere-xodnój (2, 77), Anti-Xrista (54), for: íkonopis', letopísnoe, preémnik, okrájna, perexódnyj, Anti-Xrista. These examples omit errors that, occurring only once, may be due to an oversight, and also debatable cases such as izdavná (2, 18), titulá (36), dokúmentov (128), etc. Many obvious misprints and misspellings could have been eliminated by more careful proof-reading.

A more serious criticism must be aimed at the language, which is marred by a few grammatical errors and much clumsiness. The instrumental, not the nominative, is correct on line 11, p. 97; the dative, not the genitive, should be used on p. 121 (l. 13 and 14) and on p. 122 (l. 12). The adjective for "bol'shevik" is "bol'sevistskij," not "bol'sevickij" (109, 115). The order of words is frequently strange (e.g., lines 19-21, p. 37). The choice of words is careless in such expressions as: "variagi ... pokidali značenie ..." (p. 6), or "sledovateli tragičnoj smerti ..." (p. 43), or again: "posvjatit' ... žizn'i ličnost' ..." (p. 83). Such defects could easily be corrected in a future edition.

The book is meant to be read "with the help of a dictionary" (p. v). It has no glossary or notes, but each chapter is preceded by a list of key-words used in it. Verbs are given first in the aspect in which they occur in the text, with the other aspect added. The gender of nouns ending in a soft sign is indicated—superfluously perhaps for words in *-ost'*. There is no concern, either in vocabulary or text, with order of difficulty. Chapter 1 is no simpler than Chapter 24. Moreover, the very nature of the material emphasizes "bookish" vocabulary and syntax. In spite of the montage aspect of some chapters—a feature that will hardly be noticed by learners of the language—there is thus, on the whole, little variety of language. In a language class, the book would need supplementing by a reader including a broader range of subjects and styles. It would, however, be an excellent basic text for a civilization class taught in Russian or addressed to Russian-reading students.

Marthe Blinoff
University of Minnesota

John Turkevich and Ludmilla B. Turkevich. Russian for the Scientist. New York: D. Van Nostrand Co., 1959. x, 255, \$5.95.

The appearance of this textbook dealing with Scientific Russian reflects the fast-growing interest and curiosity now being evinced by American scientists for the work of their Russian counterparts. The relatively luxurious physical aspect of the book (hard covers, dust jacket with pictures and biographical sketches of the two authors) would seem to reflect the growing confidence among publishers in the future of Russian textbooks.

In rapid summary, the contents may be indicated by the following divisions: Grammatical Introduction (pp. 1-3); twenty

lessons (pp. 5-206); eight appendices (pp. 207-233), to wit, Regular Noun Declensions, Irregular Nouns, Regular Declension of Attributive Adjectives, Declensions of Pronoun Forms, Numerals, Conjugations of Verbs, Verbs with Irregularities, Prepositions; and two glossaries (pp. 235-252). Interspersed throughout the twenty lessons are exercises and selected texts on aeronautical engineering, biology, chemistry, and physics. A Table of Contents and an Index enclose these copious contents.

In writing this book it was the aim of the authors to furnish the scientist "with a tool with which he may go to Russian scientist literature and extract the particular information that he seeks, be it a mere deciphering of titles, or a thorough study of articles" (p. iii).

The reading texts are well chosen and well organized. Each text is accompanied by vocabulary and notes, and for a few texts there are apt and helpful illustrations. This excellent textual material is the most valuable part of the book.

Though the authors have a definite talent for presenting graded and interesting scientific texts, their analysis of Russian grammar ranges from the conventional to the strange. Consider, for example, this grammatical fossil: the present tense of the verb "to be" (pp. 175, 221) — ja (esm') ty (esf') on (est') my (esmy') vy (este') onf' (sut'). Even though these forms are chastely clothed in parentheses, what are they doing in a book on 20th century Russian? Est' should, of course, be represented, but without parentheses and with explanation; if space is no object, mention might even be made of sut' and its rare use. Suščij, which is presented as the "present active participle" of this verb, should be brought up to date as an adjective, meaning "real, veritable." American students, who have enough trouble with Russian participles and gerunds, will probably not feel grateful at the discovery by the authors of two more gerunds, the "Present Passive Gerund" and the "Past Passive Gerund" (pp. 155-156), e.g., buduči čitaem, a, o, "being read" (p. 223), byvši čitaem, a, o having been read.* However, students may recover some assurance in the statement: "Though there is a passive voice, the passive gerund is generally replaced in Russian by an adverbial clause" (p. 154).

It took me some time to puzzle out the authors' Rule 3 (p. 14) for vowel selection; it reads: "The consonants ž, č, š, šč, ć are never followed by an unstressed hard vowel o but rather by e, and in stressed syllables by the soft equivalent ě." This mixes up two situations, which might be illustrated by the following examples: 1) inst. nožóm(nož) : múžem(muž); 2) inst. nedélej(nedéļja) : zemlěj(zemlja). The authors follow Von Gronicka, Yakobson, and others in positing short forms for the "soft" adjectives, using the trusty sínj, sínja, síne, síni, 'dark blue,' as examples. But these forms are rare and it is time, I believe, to accept and to state the lack of short forms for this type of adjective.

I looked in vain for a description of consonant alternations (g : ž, k : č, etc.), which would be desirable in any Russian textbook and essential in one for scientists; Russian names are not treated, though their special features might cause difficulties for the scientist-student. Here are some minor deficiencies: učennoj in za Vašej učennoj rabotoj (p. 7) should be

replaced by *naučnoj*; *solennyj* 'salty' (p. 14), should read *solenyj*; *iod* 'iodine' (p. 12), is spelled *jod* by the latest authorities; on page 34 and 238 two words are given for "molecule," *molekul* (masc.) and *molekula* (fem.), but the fem. form is, as far as I can determine, the only one accepted or even known.

The texts in this book may be used with profit, but the grammatical explanations should be approached with caution. A second edition, with a re-working of the matters mentioned above, will yield a textbook of basic value for many teachers of Russian.

Thomas F. Magner
Pennsylvania State University

Jules Koslow. The Kremlin: Eight Centuries of Tyranny and Terror. New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons [c. 1958]. vii, 244, \$5.00.

Mr. Koslow's book consists of two parts of unequal length: only in four chapters (IV, V, XII, XXI) does the author give a description of the famous Moscow fortress; in the remaining eighteen chapters he offers a general survey of Russian history, depicting in vivid language a long story of tyranny, brutality, and cruelty which, in his exposition, dominate the whole course of Russian history.

The title of the book is somewhat misleading. The author is correct when he writes: "During Stalin's regime the Kremlin became a place of terror, mystery and ruthless power, as it had been in the time of Ivan the Terrible" (p. 226). Correctly stating that after 1564 Ivan IV "acted as a man possessed" (p. 91), the author devotes four chapters to a detailed description of his terroristic activity. But when we add the time of Ivan's terror, about 20 years (1564-84), to that of the Communists' during the last forty years, there results a total of less than one century, not eight centuries. For two centuries after Peter the Great, while the capital of the Russian Empire was in Petersburg, the Kremlin was little more than a museum piece, visited by the monarchs only on festive occasions. Nor were all the Moscow Princes before Peter bloodthirsty tyrants: some were rather meek.

Furthermore, though Peter's terror had no connection with the Moscow Kremlin, it merits a very detailed description by the author, a description in which Dichtung and Wahrheit are very closely mixed. On pages 155-156 we read, for example: "There is the story that Peter together with some followers gathered together a group of bearded men in a village and ordered that they be summarily beheaded for failing to obey the order to cut off their beards." However, Peter's orders to shave beards did not concern the clergy and the peasantry, and so the Russian peasants in their villages quietly enjoyed their long beards before, during, and after Peter's reign. The Koslow book is not free from other factual errors: the founder of the Moscow princely dynasty, Daniel Alexandrovich did not rule in 1246-52 (p. 6); he was born in 1261, became a prince

of Moscow in 1283, died in 1303. The Empire of Genghis Khan did not extend in Europe to the Carpathian Mountains (p. 8), because the great Russian plain was not conquered by the Mongols until 1283-40, and Genghis Khan died in 1227. The famous letter of "a Russian monk" (*Philotheus* from a monastery in Pskov) about Moscow as the Third Rome was addressed not to Ivan III (p. 25), but to his son Basil III, about 20 years after Ivan's death. The colors of the most honored Russian military order of St. George were not black and white (p. 206), but black and yellow.

Not only were Russian Tsars, in Koslow's story, nothing but cruel and senseless tyrants—the whole mass of the Russian people, in his opinion, were a miserable crowd of Untermenschen. Under the first three Romanov czars (1613-82) "the mass of Russians were kept in such poverty and ignorance and fear that for all intents and purposes they were not solid citizenry of a nation but an abject, voiceless, and supine glob of protoplasm, living in conditions close to the animal state, without dignity and without hope" (p. 129). Yet, if we remember several important facts of Russian public life in the seventeenth century, such as the activity of the Zemskij Sobor; the popular uprisings against political and social oppression; the existence of freedom-loving and democratically organized Cossack communities on the Don, the Volga, the Ural, the Tersek, communities which were steadily reinforced by an influx of active and bold individuals from different parts of Russia, etc., then we cannot stop wondering how all this was achieved by an "abject and supine glob of protoplasm."

As typical features of the Russian people Mr. Koslow emphasizes brutality and cruelty and supports this with the statements of many witnesses (pp. 56-65, 86-88). But if we keep in mind that the Inquisition was not only a Spanish, but an all-European institution, and if we remember that in our days civilized Europeans, under Hitler's leadership, systematically and "scientifically" tortured, starved to death or poisoned in gas chambers several millions of people, then we should be less complacent about Western humanity as compared with Russian cruelty.

S. Pushkarev
New Haven, Conn.

Alfred G. Meyer. Leninism. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1957. 324 pp.

The expansion of Slavic studies in America since the last war has been notable, among other things, for a renewal of scholarly interest in the formative period of Bolshevism. To the series of recent scholarly contributions in this area a new one has now been added in Alfred G. Meyer's Leninism. Writing as a political scientist rather than historian, Professor Meyer has attempted in this volume to systematize Lenin's thought, to present Leninism as a comprehensive if not always coherent and consistent body of political ideas.

The material is presented under four main headings: the Party, the Russian Revolution, Leninism in Power, and the New Image of Capitalist Society. Lenin's fundamental political ideas and attitudes, with stress on the dichotomy of "consciousness" and "spontaneity" and on Leites' theory of "operational code," are given in the first part. Leninism as the strategy and tactics of revolution follows in Part II, and Leninism as a doctrine and practice of dictatorial Soviet rule in Part III. The last part takes up, among others, the question of Stalinism, of which it is said that it "flows directly from Leninism." This is unexceptionable in at least one important sense, though it does not necessarily follow that Stalin, as Meyer further contends, was "entirely Leninist" in his vision of the world, aims, decisions, and conceptions of the tasks facing the Soviet state.

The difficulty on this score (assuming that it is a difficulty) may arise from the absence of any substantial effort on Meyer's part to relate either Leninism or Stalinism to pre-Revolutionary patterns of Russian political thought. He tends to emphasize Marxism rather than earlier Russian thought as the point of departure for an understanding of them both. Beyond this he does, as already indicated, draw upon the psychological mode of interpretation developed in the conception of Bolshevism as an "operational code," although he states at a later point that Leninism is "far more than the operational code" and that "this code contains a great deal of ambiguity."

However, Meyer's principal aim in the book is not to interpret but to collate Lenin's views and give a critical exposition of them. This he does in a thorough and readable way, although the quality of the exposition falls off occasionally, as in the weak chapter about Lenin's views of democracy. He is strong, however, in his critical dissection of Lenin's concept of "democratic centralism" in the Party, in the stimulating discussion toward the end of the "Dialectics of Backwardness," and at numerous other points.

Having set himself a very formidable task, Meyer has made a serious and conscientious effort to resolve it, and the result is a work which both the student and advanced scholar will find useful. Yet at best it helps pave the way for that more definitive interpretive study of Leninism which we badly need and which still remains to be written.

Robert C. Tucker
Indiana University

Ralph T. Fisher, Jr. Pattern for Soviet Youth: A Study of the Congresses of the Komsomol, 1918-1954. (Studies of the Russian Institute.) New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1959. xvii, 452, \$6.75.

Professor Fisher has written by far the most systematic, comprehensive and objective study of the All-Union Lenin Communist League of Youth available in any language. No Soviet scholar and no Soviet youth leader could have written this book.

Professor Fisher's excellent study furnishes yet another proof of the fact that social and political science can flourish only in a free society.

This study fills a major gap in the scholarly literature on Soviet Russia. It presents a wealth of carefully analyzed material on perhaps the most important of all of the Soviet "mass" organizations over a period of almost thirty years. The Komsomol, as "reserve" and as "helper" of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has played a major role in creating the "new Soviet man." Professor Fisher's study reveals how this job has been done. It adds new and fascinating dimensions to our knowledge of the relentless pressures exerted upon Soviet citizens in their formative years by the leaders in the Kremlin. Professor Fisher presents his story, and his careful analysis of its major themes and episodes primarily as a discussion of the "demands" presented to Soviet youth by the Kremlin through the agency of the Komsomol. These demands, which have remained fairly constant throughout the period studied, reflected, in Professor Fisher's words, "the fundamental continuity of the Soviet regime." They included directives requiring assistance to the regime in political indoctrination, general education, industry, agriculture, social relations, military activity and world affairs.

The intensity with which these demands were pressed, the size of the constituency to which they were addressed, and the structure and the personnel of the Komsomol leadership responsible for transmitting them to that portion of Soviet youth considered worthy of membership in the Komsomol varied significantly. Dr. Fisher's discussion of variations and changes is as thorough and skillful as is his demonstration of the continuity which gave meaning to change. Among the interesting elements of dynamism which are discussed are those of class, ethnic, and educational composition of the Komsomol, as well as its growth in membership. In connection with ethnic composition, the author reveals such significant facts as the dropping, in 1949, of the Jewish, Polish, and German groups from membership statistics in connection with the eleventh Komsomol congress. At the Twelfth Congress, in 1954, no statistics of ethnic composition of the delegates were presented at all.

Perhaps the most interesting and dramatic episodes discussed by Professor Fisher, which at the same time give emphasis to his basic theme of the Kremlin's "obsession with control" both outside and within the Komsomol, are those connected with changes in Komsomol leadership. As in other spheres of Soviet political life, purgers who achieved power by eliminating their predecessors in the name of political loyalty were themselves, often, removed under similar auspices. In his discussions of personnel changes, Mr. Fisher also sheds very interesting light on Soviet propaganda and organizational techniques and on the original nature of Soviet "elections." In these and many other ways this very well-written study has provided information and insight of great value to all serious students of Soviet politics and history.

Frederick C. Barghoorn
Yale University

Roman Gul'. Skif v Evrope: Bakunin i Nikolaj I. New York: Most, 1958. 208 pp. (Supplied for review by Telberg Book Co., 544 Sixth Ave., New York.)

Having a most adventurous life which in itself was like a work of fiction, Bakunin, unlike his comrades-in-arms, had already become in his own time an object of attraction to the authors of the creative word. In Russian literature we find his portrait in novel form by Ivan Turgenev, in poetry by Ivan Aksakov, and in the dramas of Dmitri Merežkovskij and Konstantin Fedin. Shortly after World War I there was a long discussion among Russian literary critics as to whether Bakunin was the prototype of Dostoevskij's Prince Stavrogin in The Possessed (see the book: Spor o Bakunine i Dostoevskom, Leningrad, 1926). There is also an Italian novel on Bakunin by R. Bacchelli, The Devil on the Long Bridge, which has been translated into English. Since Bakunin suffered the fate of those whose influence on their contemporaries depends on the spoken word and that elusive gift called personality, it has been the task, not so much of his biographers, but primarily of the authors of fiction, to rescue for posterity that sense of overwhelming power which was always present to those who knew him in his life.

In this line falls the novel of Roman Gul' Skif v Evrope. This book is an abbreviation rather than recasting of his previous two-volumes novel Skif, published in 1931 in Berlin. The very genre of historical novel puts some limits on its authors. Unlike pure fiction, where the *élan* of poetry is achieved by blending the most deep-seated subjective with the objective for the creation of a reality of a higher grade, and the outer reality shrinks to a motive and it is of no consequence whether it is invented or real, in historical novel the author is more or less bound to historical matter; he is serving it. On the other hand he never can sink to a mere chronicler, retelling the events, but he must be an illuminator who makes the reality transparent. What is translucent in his work is not his own life reality, but the historical one. He certainly is free in making use of invention in situations, thoughts, moods, even of personalities, but his freedom cannot essentially impair the identification of historical reality. Therefore this high grade of license is the most difficult one and is the real cliff of a historical novel.

Mr. Gul's book concentrates primarily on Bakunin's participation in the 1848 Revolution. The rest is by and large the necessary prologue and epilogue. The novel keeps close to the current of historical events, and the personages frequently talk in the language of documents and memoirs. By using dialogue primarily and cutting the story into very short chapters, the author makes narrative a smooth one, but on the other hand it comes close to a motion-picture scenario and therefore presents its necessary limits. The stage in the book is packed to full capacity with the personalities whom Bakunin met on his path of life, and this certainly helps to render genuine the aura of his surroundings. Through such a device, however, the main actors suffer. Bakunin and Nicholas I emerge too schematic, sometimes too dull. Yet even the Tsar was not such a one as this, not to mention Bakunin.

On the whole the elusive gift of Bakunin's personality remained to an extent elusive in Mr. Gul's novel also. Since this personality was a rare and exceptional one, it is perhaps impossible or at least most difficult to recapture it in a relatively short novel. Yet, despite these remarks, Mr. Gul's book presents pleasant reading which will certainly serve for the introductory acquaintance with this one time so famous and notorious, but today rather forgotten, personality of a world revolutionist.

Eugene Pyziur
New York City

Mikhail Zetlin. The Decembrists. Tr. George Panin, Preface Michael M. Karpovich. New York: International Univ. Press [c. 1958]. 349 pp., \$5.00.

The Russians have practiced with great success a genre that is a particularly felicitous blend of literature and historical scholarship. Neither historical fiction, which disregards historical evidence, nor historical analysis which neglects the human and dramatic elements, successfully strikes the proper balance between exclusive reliance on documented facts and original sources on the one hand, and perceptive understanding of the dramatic and psychological human reality behind the events, on the other. M. Gerzenzon's Griboedovskaja Moskva was one of the most successful examples of this kind of writing. It is the tradition Mikhail Zetlin followed in writing the history of the Decembrists, characteristically subtitled in the original Russian edition (Paris, 1933) "The Fate of a Generation."

The purpose as well as the peculiar merit of the book has been well stated by Professor Karpovich in his Preface: "He [Zetlin] based his book on a thorough knowledge of documentary material and historical literature, but to this he added the creative writer's intuitive insight into the style of the age and the psychology of the movement" (pp. 7-8). In carrying out his difficult task, the late M. Zetlin displayed a perceptive and profound understanding for the problems and tragedies of a first generation of rebels against a well-established traditional order: tragedy compounded by the fact that these precursors belonged to the ruling class of the system they opposed. Zetlin was steeped in Russian history and literature; he was writing for a cultivated and informed audience of educated Russian émigrés. He could cite from Russian literature, make allusions to individuals, places, and events which were readily understood and meaningful to his readers. That is why his book had depth, richness, wisdom, and that is why it was also particularly vivid and dramatic without being glib.

It was obviously a very difficult task to "transpose" such a book into another language for a reading public largely ignorant of the cultural background which gave Zetlin's writing such richness and depth. Unfortunately, however, Mr. George Panin has carried out his task even less successfully than could be expected. It is not a matter of style, for Panin's English is

fluent and vivid enough. But his version is not so much a translation as an adaptation, and an abridged one at that. Some excisions were fully justified, as many passages would have been meaningless to a reader who was not familiar with Russian history or literature. Other omissions, however, were not at all justified. As a result, the book has lost most of its flavor and intellectual richness. The English version is shallow and flat; it reminds one too much of the superficially exciting, less than accurate historical writing one meets with in popular books.

Some of the inaccuracies and blemishes of translation, editing, and proof reading can be forgiven and disregarded (though it should have been easy to avoid writing Podgio for Poggio or Loebzeltern for Lebzelttern). Other errors, on the other hand, illustrate ignorance of rather elementary things and are quite annoying. For instance, not only is the translator confused by the existence of the two Turgenev brothers, Alexander and Nicholas, but he makes matters worse by imagining a non-existing family relationship between them and the novelist Ivan Turgenev. And what are we to make of the assertion that Alexander Turgenev was the father of Ivan Sergeevich Turgenev?

More serious than these technical defects is the fundamental unevenness in tone of the English version. The first part underlines the unpleasant personal traits, foolishness, and outright stupidity of the young conspirators. The reader takes a superior and sneering attitude towards them. In the second part, however, their arrest and subsequent trial and suffering are depicted with great feeling and much sympathy. From unpleasant fools they become martyrs worthy of our admiration. This is not a very convincing picture. This is a picture which M. Zetlin never intended to give. While he did not cover up the inadequacies of his heroes before 1825, he did point up those features of their thought, position, and action that made of their failures and consequent punishment a real human and historical tragedy with which we can—and should—sympathize. In contrast, the English version does not even give a satisfactory picture of the events and is hardly more successful in clarifying the meaning and import of the Decembrist movement, both in terms of Russia's history and in terms of the personal fate of a generation of Russia's élite.

This is a great pity, indeed. There is such a crying need for reliable but well written books on Russian history! Mikhail Zetlin's work might have been an answer to this need; the present English version, alas, is not.

M. Raeff
Clark University

John A. Armstrong. The Soviet Bureaucratic Elite: A Case Study of the Ukrainian Apparatus. New York: F. A. Praeger [c. 1959]. 174 pp., \$6.00.

During recent years, there has been growing interest in

the spread and diffusion of the bureaucratic mode of organization in modern life (especially under the impact of Max Weber's ideas regarding this field). While, until recently, public administration has been traditionally the prerogative of political scientists, sociologists have been contributing lately definite studies on administration. Armstrong's "Case Study of the Ukrainian Apparatus" is definitely a valuable addition here. Using numerous individual examples combined with detailed statistical analyses, he describes the background characteristics, the career patterns, and the rate of turnover of officials within many categories of the Soviet bureaucracy. His generalizations are based on the scattered information from the Ukrainian press and a considerable amount of comparative material from general Soviet publications and from the local press in other areas. Evidently he obtained also access to a number of unpublished academic dissertations dealing with the Ukrainian and the Soviet apparatus during his two recent visits to the U.S.S.R. The sociologist must especially appreciate Armstrong's ability to describe the frictions and divergencies among various career groups of the Party, as well as between the Party and other power elements, in addition to the "conflict of generations" between the officials who secured high posts after the Purge and those who comprise the newer group. From the standpoint of contemporary events, we learn here how the Ukrainian role has been a reservoir from which Kruščev has been drawing his lieutenants, his operational methods, and his managerial abilities.

An original and a dynamic work!

Joseph S. Roucek
University of Bridgeport

Le Livre de la genèse du peuple Ukrainien. Tr. Georges Luciani. (Collection historique de l'Institut d'Etudes slaves, XVII.) Paris: Institut d'Etudes slaves, 1956. 149 pp.

After La Légende historique de l'Ukraine by E. Borščak, this is the second volume concerning Ukrainica in the excellent Historical Collection of the Institut d'Etudes slaves in Paris, headed by André Mazon. Georges Luciani in his work renders the first complete translation of the famous Knyhy bytija ukraiins'koho narodu by M. Kostomarov, published for the first time in its original Ukrainian version by P. Zajcev in Naše Mynule, Vol. I, No. 1, 1918. The author of the French translation gives a photostatic reproduction of each page of this edition and, on the right side, the French translation of it. Numerous footnotes on each page refer to the contents of Knyhy as well as to their language.

The value of the book under review lies not only in the translation and explanatory remarks of Luciani. The most important part of the book is a thorough study of the origin, ideology, and literary affiliation of Knyhy. In the first chapter, the author discusses the Ukrainian circle of Xarkiv and its leader M. Kostomarov. The second chapter offers a detailed study of

the history of "St. Cyril and Methodius Brotherhood" and its ideological trends, while the fourth one gives the particulars of its liquidation by the Russian Tsarist regime. The last chapter gives an account of the Knyhy and is an introduction to the texts and the translation. Although the author is aware of nearly all important works in this field, some recent publications are missing (by L. Bilećkyj, B. Janivškyj, J. P. Sydoruk, etc.). These works would have helped the author in his study and in the translation itself. Having full respect for the text of Zajcev, we should prefer, however, the editions of Janivškyj, especially with regard to the standard Ukrainian spelling of today.

But such gaps in the literature and the technical rendering of the original text are of minor importance. They are certainly not meant by this reviewer to disparage this publication as a whole, which stands as a distinguished scholarly contribution to the subject and is a real *novum* in French Slavistics. Le Livre is a splendid work and a fine example to young French scholars entering the field of Slavic studies.

J. B. Rudnyčkyj
University of Manitoba

Paul E. Zinner, ed. National Communism and Popular Revolt in Eastern Europe: A Selection of Documents on Events in Poland and Hungary, February-November, 1956. New York: Columbia University Press, 1956. xx, 563, \$2.95.

[Marshall Andrews, ed.] Anatomy of Revolution: A Condensation of the United Nations Report on the Hungarian Uprising. Washington, D.C.: Public Affairs Press, [c. 1957]. 65 pp. \$1.00.

National Communism and Popular Revolt in Eastern Europe does not pretend, as is clearly stated in the Preface, to be a history of the events in reference. It is a collection of documents, and it carries the common advantages and disadvantages shared by any collection of historical documents. Some connective narrative is provided to supply the chronology to events outside of the documents.

Documents are dull, especially the long-winded and repetitious discourses of Communists. Still, the reading of these documents is rewarding, for they reflect at first hand the picture and state of mind of Communism in a period of general change and upheaval during 1956. The collection is based almost totally on original printed sources or, in other cases, on radio broadcasts, where newspaper publications were not available.

On October 24, 1956, the address of Wladyslaw Gomulka, the First Secretary of the Polish United Workers Party, before a Citizen's Rally (pp. 270-276) gives the Polish solution arrived at in the general debate and discussion among Communists throughout 1956 concerning the vital problem of relations between the Soviet Union and other Communist states. This general debate is documented by Zinner from February to

September 1956, direct from Communist voices and publications.

With the Polish solution achieved and known to the Hungarians, the Hungarian students desired to express their historically kindred feelings toward the Poles in their success in finding a solution to this paramount problem—the relation of the Soviet Union to a nation under Communist control. The direction of popular feeling had been to limit Soviet interference in local and national life and government.

The "second-half" of this story may be found in the best-seller of recent diplomatic literature—perhaps the first time that such a "diplomatic best-seller" has appeared—the Report of the Special Committee on the Problem of Hungary published by the United Nations. To make this Report of over 140,000 words more accessible and more readable for the average reader, the Public Affairs Press has published a condensation prepared by Marshall Andrews. This abbreviated Report originally appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald.

A striking parallel between titles and eminence as best-sellers may be drawn between the number-one best-seller in fiction for many months, Anatomy for Murder, and the condensed version of the Report, Anatomy of Revolution. Marshall Andrews in 65 pages tells in pointed fashion the story of the "murder" of the Hungarians in their fight for freedom.

Although the report of the United Nation's committee has been much shortened in Anatomy of Revolution, the language is that of the committee, or of the report, except for a minimum of explanatory insertions by the editor, all of which are enclosed in parentheses.

The United Nation's committee met in five countries and heard over 100 witnesses from all strata of Hungarian life. The testimony thus gathered fills 2000 pages of verbatim record. Hundreds of documents were studied, including correspondence volunteered by Hungarians who could not be heard. On February 10, 1957, an interim report was filed, and on June 12 the committee filed a full report.

After six months of study and interviewing Communists and non-Communists, the committee reached a unanimous agreement on its findings: "What took place in Hungary in October and November, 1956, was a spontaneous, natural uprising, due to long-standing grievances which had caused resentment among the people." It was not a planned revolution. "The thesis that the uprising was fomented by reactionary circles in Hungary and that it drew its strength from such circles and from Western 'Imperialists' failed to survive the Committee's examination. From start to finish, the uprising was led by students, workers, soldiers and intellectuals, many of whom were Communists or former Communists."

A. J. Molnar
Elmhurst College

Clifford R. Barnett et al. Poland: Its People, Its Society, Its Culture. (Survey of World Cultures.) New York: Grove Press [c. 1958]. iv, 471, \$2.45.

This new book on Polish affairs meets a definite need. It appeared at a time when Poland has become a focus of renewed interest as a test case of Communist flexibility in adapting the Red doctrine to a specific historical and cultural background.

According to the Preface, the book is concerned with the joint relationship of many aspects usually studied separately. Not only the present, but also the whole historical past is embraced. The book deals with geographical, ethnic, and linguistic problems; it reveals religious life as well as external and internal policy; it describes the economy of Poland, its agriculture, industry, and commerce; it reflects various aspects of the country's social and cultural life. Such a publication becomes practically an encyclopedia of Polish matters.

A concerted approach was necessary not only from the methodical point of view, but also as the only way to interpret convincingly the dramatic events of 1956, and consequent changes in the national situation. Nevertheless, if a book of limited size was planned, the enterprise was certainly a very ambitious one and could be fulfilled only with partial success. Perhaps some segregation of the material would have brought better results. Another possible solution was, of course, the addition of a substantial number of pages.

Generally speaking, the past was condensed for the benefit of contemporary events. The proportions were reversed: only a relatively small part of the book deals with events which extended over about one thousand years, while the last thirteen years were thoroughly analyzed. The country was treated as an almost isolated island, loosely connected with European life as a whole. Some very complicated problems of Polish history were drastically simplified.

There is another point worth examining. Recent data are always given in close association with the past, as if they formed a normal sequence of events. Although the weight of foreign pressure was given due consideration, one still may get the impression that the post-war situation was a logical new stage of national life. This is obviously, to say the least, a highly controversial matter, and a more cautious attitude in its interpretation should be recommended.

It must be admitted that a vast amount of valuable information is included in the book. An objective attitude was generally maintained, and no preconceived tendency could be noted. Most of the book's faults are due to over-simplification. Occasionally the dates given in different chapters are not quite consistent, and careful comparison is needed to acquire the right perspective. This is one of the weaknesses of collective work, and it is not easy to overcome.

Surprisingly enough, the role of creative culture in this book is that of a Cinderella. The authors' remarks on Poland's literary past are incomplete and in part obsolete. Krasinski has lost much of his former prestige; Norwid, who is not mentioned in the book, is quite influential among modern writers.

The one page dealing with Polish scholarship and science does not adequately reflect the achievement in this field.

A list of controversial or inaccurate statements in the book would be rather long, so only a few of them can be mentioned. It is not true, for instance, that many Russian landowners remained in the eastern provinces of Poland (p. 366). German influence started much earlier than the fifteenth century, at which time it was actively counteracted. The question of the autonomy of Polish universities should not be linked only with the year 1933 (p. 336). Humanism did not deeply influence the Cracow University, which lost much of its prestige in the sixteenth century.

The positive efforts of the new government after 1956 are carefully listed, but the story is not yet complete. It is not clear whether the concessions that were made were a sincere attempt to restore some freedoms or just another tactical maneuver. Recent news points to a gradual, but relentless tightening of the screws in the cultural sphere. Further developments may depend on political events, and the content of the book may soon become obsolete; but for the time being it is a valuable guide for the average student of Polish affairs. In spite of its shortcomings it is a useful introduction to one of the fascinating problems of central Europe.

Mieczyslaw Giergiewicz
University of California (Berkeley)

BOOKS RECEIVED

Louis Greyfié de Bellecombe. Les Conventions collectives de travail en Union Soviétique. (Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes, Sorbonne, VI^e Section: Sciences économiques et sociales.) Paris: Mouton and Co., 1958. 172 pp.

Vaclav L. Benes, Robert F. Byrnes, Nicolas Spulber, eds. The Second Soviet-Yugoslav Dispute: Full Text of Main Documents, April-June 1958, With an Introductory Analysis. (Slavic and East European Series, Vol. 14.) [Bloomington:] Indiana Univ. Pubs., 1959. xlii, 272, \$3.50.

Charles E. Bidwell. Slavic Historical Phonology in Tabular Form. Pittsburgh, Pa.: Author [c. 1959]. 45 pp. (mimeographed).

Andrey Biely. St. Petersburg. Tr. John Cournos. New York: Grove Press [c. 1959]. xxii, 310, \$4.75.

Valentine T. Bill. The Forgotten Class: The Russian Bourgeoisie from the Earliest Beginnings to 1900. New York: F. A. Praeger [c. 1959]. 229 pp., \$5.00.

Robert F. Byrnes, ed. The Non-Western Areas in Undergraduate Education in Indiana. (Slavic and East European Series, Vol. XV.) Indiana Univ. Pubs. [n. d.]. xi, 106, \$2.00.

Canadian Slavonic Papers, III. University of Toronto Press, 1958. 121 pp., \$3.00.

- Anton Chekhov. The Brute and Other Farces. Ed. Eric Bentley. New York: Grove Press, 1958. vii, 99, \$1.45.
- Marion M. Coleman, ed. Lechitica: In Honor of Charlotte Bielawski-Yess (1917-1957). Cambridge Springs, Pa.: Alliance College Pubs., 1958. 35 pp., \$1.00.
- Dictionary of Spoken Russian: Russian-English, English-Russian. New York: Dover Pubs. [n.d.]. v, 573, \$2.75.
- Richard Hare. Portraits of Russian Personalities Between Reform and Revolution. New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1959. xii, 360, \$6.75.
- George Alexander Lensen. The Russian Push Toward Japan: Russo-Japanese Relations, 1697-1875. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton Univ. Press, 1959. xv, 553, \$10.00.
- Thomas F. Magner. The Russian Alphabet. St. Paul, Minn.: EMC Recordings Corp. [c. 1959]. 24 pp., \$1.00.
- Nicholas Maltzoff. Russian Reading and Conversation—Kniga dlja čtenija i razgovora. 2nd ed. New York: Pitman Publ. Corp. [c. 1959]. vi, 156, \$2.50.
- Tibor Meray. Thirteen Days That Shook the Kremlin. Tr. Howard L. Katzander. New York: F. A. Praeger [c. 1959]. vii, 290, \$5.00.
- Richard Pipes. Karamzin's Memoir on Ancient and Modern Russia: A Translation and Analysis. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1959. xiv, 266, \$5.50.
- Abraham Rothberg, ed. Anatomy of a Moral: The Political Essays of Milovan Djilas. Intr. Paul Willen. New York: F. A. Praeger [c. 1959]. 181 pp., \$2.95.
- J. B. Rudnyckyj. Ukrainian-Canadian Folklore and Dialectological Texts, II. Winnipeg: Ukrainian Free Academy of Sciences, 1958. Pp. 285-541. (In Ukrainian.)
- Yar Slavutych. Oasis: Selected Poems. Tr. from Ukrainian, Morse Manly. New York: Vantage Press [c. 1959]. 63 pp., \$2.50.
- Roman Smal Stocki. Shevchenko and the Jews. (Papers, No. 8.) Chicago: Shevchenko Scientific Society Study Center, 1959. 11 pp.
- Edmund Stillman, ed. Bitter Harvest: The Intellectual Revolt Behind the Iron Curtain. New York: F. A. Praeger [c. 1959]. xxxiii, 313, \$5.00.
- William I. Thomas and Florian Znaniecki. The Polish Peasant in Europe and America. 2 vols. New York: Dover Pubs. [n.d.]. xv, 1114 pp.; vi, 1115-2250 pp.; \$12.50.
- Rush Welter. Problems of Scholarly Publication in the Humanities and Social Sciences. New York: American Council of Learned Societies [c. 1959]. xi, 81 pp.
- Helen B. Yakobson. Beginners Book in Russian. Washington, D.C.: Educational Services, 1959. ii, 124, \$2.75 (mimeographed).

NEWS AND NOTES

"Modern Foreign Languages in the Comprehensive Secondary School"—An Important Pronouncement

The major project of the National Association of Secondary School Principals Committee on Curriculum Planning and Development in 1958-59 was "Modern Foreign Languages in the Comprehensive Secondary School." Its report was published in the June 1959 issue of the Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary-School Principals. This is a document of major importance to teachers of foreign languages.

Its Introduction begins bluntly: "We might as well face it. . . . All indications point to a renaissance of language teaching and language learning in our secondary schools. This does not mean more of the same kind of traditional emphasis that has characterized a good deal of modern language instruction for years. It does mean modern languages taught and learned with beginning emphasis on communication rather than on grammatical structure." The major sections include "The Importance of Modern Language Study," "An Effective Approach to Modern Language Study" (the aural-oral method), "The Place and Kind of Modern Language," and "Steps the Principal Can Take to Implement These Recommendations." The report concludes with an Appendix quoting "Qualifications for Secondary-School Teachers of Modern Foreign Languages," prepared by the Steering Committee of the Foreign Language Program of the MLA and endorsed by the Modern Language Committee of the Secondary Education Board, the AATSEEL, and numerous other organizations; and a brief listing of "Significant References to Modern Foreign Languages in the Comprehensive Secondary School."

The report directly faces the question of offering Russian in the secondary school, as follows: "The study of Russian may be as urgent as the study of any Western European language. . . . The national need for proficiency in Russian is acute and deserves high priority. But unless competent teachers, continuity in program, and appropriate instructional materials can be secured, it makes no more sense for schools to initiate a study of Russian than to do so in any other modern foreign language."

Individuals may obtain reprints of the "Report" from the National Association of Secondary-School Principals, 1201 Sixteenth St., N.W., Washington, D.C. All members of the profession interested in the question of Russian in the high school should thoroughly familiarize themselves with this report and should make it available where needed.

AATSEEL Chapter Meetings

New England Chapter (reported by Valerie Turnins). The Annual Meeting of the New England Chapter of the AATSEEL was held on April 25, 1959, in the Radcliffe Graduate Center, Cambridge, Mass., with Catherine Pastuhova, Smith Coll., as chairman. Renato Poggioli, Harvard Univ., gave a talk on Pasternak's Dr. Živago and Tolstoj's War and Peace. His interesting comparison of these two works, of the different historic perspectives in which they were written, aroused lively discussion.

Valerie Turnins, Regis Coll., gave a brief report on FL co-ordination and on the work of the Advisory Committee of Foreign Language Consultants in Massachusetts. In the business session, Prof. Turnins, who will be at Brown Univ. beginning with fall 1959, was elected president, and Joachim Baer, Harvard Univ., secretary-treasurer.

New York-New Jersey Regional Chapter (reported by Olga S. Fedoroff). The annual spring conference of the New York-New Jersey Regional Chapter of the AATSEEL was held May 15-16, 1959, at Columbia Univ. The conference opened with an evening meeting on May 15 at Harkness Theatre, with Albert Parry of Colgate Univ. presiding. A welcoming address was given by Leon Stilman, Chairman of the Department of Slavic Languages, Columbia Univ. Paul M. Glaude, Supervisor of Foreign Language Education, New York State Education Department, Albany, surveyed the qualifications and certification requirements for teachers of Russian in his address, "Who Should Teach Russian?" The question "Is Television the Answer?" was discussed by Katherine Alexeieff, Instructor, and Amram Nowak, Russian Language Television course, Metropolitan Education Television Association, New York City.

On Saturday morning a demonstration of the Language Laboratory was given in Philosophy Hall. In the afternoon there was a symposium on "Textbooks and Teaching Methods," with Ludmilla B. Turkevich, Princeton Univ., as chairman. Participating in the symposium were Rebecca A. Domar, Columbia Univ.; Mischa H. Fayer, Middlebury Coll.; Aron Pressman, New York Univ.; Catherine Wolkonsky, Vassar Coll.; and Helen Yakobson, George Washington Univ.

Olga S. Fedoroff, USAFIT Language Program, Syracuse Univ., gave a brief Treasurer's report, and expressed the conference's thanks to Laimonas Klausatis, USAFIT Language Program, for recording the proceedings.

André Von Gronicka and Christopher C. Warren were in charge of arrangements.

Florida Chapter (reported by Michael A. Negrich). The eighth annual spring meeting of the Florida chapter of the AATSEEL was held at the Univ. of Miami on May 23. A special treat which preceded the formal meeting was a dramatization of Češov's The Bear by members of one of the classes taught by Mrs. Eva Friedl, Univ. of Miami. After a luncheon in the Student Union cafeteria, a short business meeting was conducted by Mrs. Friedl, at which time a message was read from Dr. Jay F. W. Pearson, President of the University of Miami,

addressed to Dr. and Mrs. Friedl from Leningrad, where he was on a short visit together with leading citizens of Miami; greetings were also read from various Slavists and AATSEEL national officers.

Prof. Berthold Friedl, head of the Department of Slavic Studies at the Univ. of Miami, presented, as discussants on the question "Research in Linguistics, Methodology, and Audio-Visual Aids—Basis for the Establishment of a Language Institute Under the NDEA," Samuel F. Harby and Andrew H. Yarrow, who told of the most important concepts and techniques in their fields that are of interest to Russian-language teachers. Dr. Harby pointed out that Dade County alone has a \$500,000 budget for audio-visual aids, and Dr. Yarrow discussed theories and techniques of linguistics to which language teachers should give more thought.

Mrs. Santa Riegler, Manatee Junior Coll. (Bradenton, Fla.), spoke on "Teaching Russian to Adults." Individual accounts on "Russian in Dade and Broward Counties Secondary Schools" were given next. The reports by Virginia Williamson (Jackson High, Miami) and Michael Negrich (North Miami Senior High), Walter F. Walker (Hialeah High), and Michael Smith (Ft. Lauderdale High), showed what can be done by enthusiastic, clever teachers. Robert H. MacDonald told of his experiences in teaching Russian in the Opa-Locka Elementary School. A report was read, prepared by Serge Zenkovsky, Stetson Univ. reporting that a number of high schools in the central belt of Florida have begun Russian instruction or plan to do so in 1959-60 or 1960-61. Theodore Concevitch, of Sarasota, reported about the classes in conversational Russian which he has been conducting at the Sarasota High School and gave an evaluation of Introduction to Russian, the recently published textbook by Eva Friedl. The president next gave a talk, "Nicholas Gogol: to the 150th Anniversary of his Birth." This was followed by an announcement of the William G. Hurst Summer Session Russian Studies Scholarship at the Univ. of Miami, given by Mr. Hurst, of Gulfport, Fla.

Officers elected for 1959-60 include Mrs. Friedl, president; Mrs. Riegler and Grace Dupre Brown, Miami Beach Senior High School, vice presidents; Mr. Negrich, secretary; Miss Williamson, corresponding secretary; and Joseph A. Tucker, Miami Beach Senior High School, treasurer.

Ohio Chapter (reported by Nadya S. Sadowski). After lunch at the Oberlin Inn, the members went to the German House for the business meeting, which was called to order at 1:45 p.m., on May 2, 1959. Morton Benson, Ohio Univ., the president, introduced the speakers of the afternoon. Dean Blair Stewart, Oberlin Coll., reported on various aspects of foreign language instruction in the Soviet Union. Prof. Thals Lindstrom, Western Reserve Univ., reported on the progress of Russian-language teaching on television in the Cleveland area. She traced the idea from its origin through its realization, commented on its success, and made some predictions about its future growth. Prof. Benson read a report by Justina Epp, Ohio State Univ., about foreign-language teaching in Ohio. George Maciuszko suggested that Profs. Lindstrom and Erminne Bartelmez keep in touch with new teachers of Russian in the Cleveland area so

that they may keep them informed of activities of the OFLC. Prof. Epp was chosen delegate to the next OFLC meeting, to be held in Cleveland.

Prof. Benson introduced Fr. William Patala, Bridgeport, Ohio, who summarized and modified somewhat views which he expressed recently in an article published in Most, a Slovak language publication, on the subject of teaching Slavic languages at the high school level. On the recommendation of the nominating committee, composed of Profs. Epp and Maciuszko, the following officers were elected for 1959-60: Prof. Benson, president, and Frank Silbajoris, Oberlin Coll., secretary-treasurer.

Report of Committee for the Promotion of Russian and Other East European Languages in the American Secondary Schools

The teaching of Russian on the secondary and college level continues to grow. According to information received by me, Russian was taught in 1958-59 in 269 colleges and universitites (a considerable increase over last year's figure of 183), 328 high schools and 12 junior high schools, and in 60 unverified secondary schools. [For the somewhat different figures compiled by the National Information Center, see above, pp. 272-279. —Editor.] Miss Ilo Remer, U.S. Office of Education is also compiling a list of schools teaching Russian, by states. I continue to maintain liaison with Dr. Johnston of the U.S. Office of Education. In this connection, we all know that the Office of Education is going to be in possession of considerable funds designated for the improvement of all foreign language teaching, and particularly the so-called "critical" languages, of which Russian is one.

At the present time, Russian is included in the program of the following summer institutes: Universities Michigan, Texas, and Washington; a nine-month regular-session institute has been set up at Indiana University, beginning this fall. In the next three years, the number of summer institutes and language and area centers will be steadily on the increase: 55 summer institutes by 1961; 12 institutes at present. (Lists of summer institutes and centers are available from Dr. Mildenberger, Office of Education.) Employment opportunities are going to be on the increase in our profession.

Funds have been allocated through the National Defense Education Act for

1. The Center for Applied Linguistics established in Washington, D.C., on a grant of \$200,000 and supervised by MLA.
2. MLA to prepare a national roster of foreign language teachers on the elementary and secondary school levels.
3. MLA to conduct a survey of the available teaching materials in all language fields and also to prepare the teaching materials needed by the summer institutes. (Russian materials are being prepared by Mary Thompson, FL Supervisor of Gladensbury, Conn.)

4. MLA to provide a series of tests to demonstrate foreign language proficiency of teachers.

5. MLA to prepare lists of available teaching materials in Russian on the elementary school level.

(Mrs. Bostroem and Prof. Birkmaier, our two Committee members, are in charge of the Russian list.) Our bibliography of teaching materials has been absorbed by the U.S. Office of Education and is available for distribution from Miss Ilo Remer, Office of Education, 7th & D Sts., S.W., Washington 25, D.C.)

In order to facilitate the work of the foreign language supervisors, with the state departments of education, the Office of Education urges cooperation between various AATS on the state level. It considers such organizations by state rather than by field of specialization a much more effective tool in working with the various state departments of education and serving as centers for disseminating information and the enforcement of the desirable high standards of foreign language teaching.

In this connection it is interesting to note that several such organizations have already been formed and have proved to be of valuable assistance to the Office of Education, state departments of education, and to the foreign language teaching profession at large. Since the MLA strongly supports this policy and since our Committee, too, is organized on a regional basis, I think it would be highly desirable for the members of our Committee either to be represented in the state organizations or to work with the other AAT coordinators and representatives of foreign language groups to establish such an organization. The subjoined statement prepared at the meeting of the Advisory Liaison Committee of the MLA FL program might be of interest in this respect. The State Councils on Foreign Language Teaching are represented as follows: New York by our member Prof. Holtzman; Connecticut, Mrs. Bostroem; Massachusetts, Valerie Turnins; New Mexico, no representation.

The MLA Conference in New York, at which your Committee was represented by its Chairman, discussed many items of great interest and impact for the future development in our field. Of greatest interest to you perhaps would be the following:

1. MLA is rapidly becoming a "big-time, big-money operation" since they received (a) a matching \$50,000 grant from Carnegie to increase the professional personnel in the MLA office and (b) many grants and contracts from the Office of Education for the above-mentioned surveys and programs.

2. Closer contact between the various AATS and the MLA was urged. I hope this topic will be discussed at the next business meeting of AATSEEL.

3. The generally optimistic mood of more money, better facilities, and improved status of foreign language teachers.

One last item is the growing number of Russian TV courses. There are 17 such courses at present.

Helen Yakobson, Chairman

State Foreign Language Supervisors

Helen Yakobson, newly appointed Liaison Officer of the AATSEEL to the MLA Advisory Liaison Committee, Foreign Language Program, recommends that the function of members of the Committee for the Promotion of Russian and other East European Languages in the Secondary Schools be combined, where appropriate, with those of state AATSEEL FL co-ordinators. She stresses that FL co-ordinators for various languages should take the initiative to get together and exert joint action to suggest to state commissioners the names of suitable persons for supervisor for foreign languages, where one has not been named; and to offer services and help in an advisory capacity, where one has been named.

At its meeting on May 23-24, 1959, the Advisory-Liaison Committee of the Modern Language Association Foreign Language Program [which includes two Slavists, Prof. William B. Edgerson, Indiana Univ.; and Helen Yakobson, George Washington Univ., for the AATSEEL], prepared and approved the following statement, and recommends to the Chief State School Officers that State Foreign Language Supervisors possess these qualifications:

1. A Master's degree with a major or the equivalent of a major in a modern foreign language.
2. A fluent speaking knowledge of at least one foreign language.
3. A mature knowledge of the related foreign culture, preferably with a recent experience in the foreign country.
4. At least five years successful experience teaching a modern foreign language, including experience in elementary and/or secondary school.
5. Some experience and prestige in teachers' organizations and committees on curriculum planning.
6. The ability to assist teachers in the State with information and advice on specific foreign language matters, such as teaching materials for modern foreign languages in the elementary and secondary schools, the aural-oral presentation of language material in the class, drill techniques, the effective utilization of audio-visual equipment and materials for language practice; and to assume responsibility for leadership in workshops, institutes, class demonstrations, and personal and group conferences.

Prof. Albert Parry's Survey of Russian-Language Instruction

Early this year, Prof. Albert Parry, Chairman of the Department of Russian Studies at Colgate University, was asked by the Fund for the Advancement of Education (Ford Foundation) to conduct a nation-wide survey in order to ascertain the extent to which the Russian language is being taught in this country, the availability or shortage of Russian-language teaching personnel on all levels, and the competence of such personnel

where it is available. Dr. Parry's survey and recommendations were to be used by the Fund as a basis for considering the desirability of offering Russian-language instruction instruction over television, either nationally, regionally, or locally. The Fund, highly satisfied with the success of its Continental Classroom television course in physics, was investigating possibilities of expanding the Classroom program by adding in September 1959 a nationwide television course in either chemistry, or mathematics, or Russian.

In mid-February, as the result of six weeks of his intensive work on the assignment, Dr. Parry submitted to the Fund his 121-page report. Its first 29 pages were devoted to his findings as to the extent of Russian-language instruction: in colleges and universities (both with regard to regular courses and to special work in Scientific Russian); in secondary schools; in elementary schools; and concerning adult education courses. The next 17 pages dealt with reasons for slowness of introduction of Russian in America's secondary schools. Here Dr. Parry discussed the fading of the early post-Sputnik determination to introduce Russian; opposition from teachers of other languages; the overcrowded curriculum; opposition social and political; fear of the novel and the difficult shortage of qualified teachers; and the barrier of certification. The following 19 pages appraised the current availability and competence of Russian-language teachers in America, either in reserve or training—both the hard core of the trained and the experienced, and prospective teachers. In the latter category Dr. Parry included four sub-categories: middle-aged native Russians; young Americans majoring in Russian; teachers of other languages willing to learn Russian; and sons and daughters of Russian D.P.'s.

The second half of the report opened with Dr. Parry's description and evaluation of Russian-language television courses then (February 1959) existing in the United States. It concluded with his recommendations to the Fund, which, among others, included Dr. Parry's suggestion of Ford Foundation help to those of the already existing local TV courses of Russian which by then had proved their excellence; also his recommendation that a national telecourse of the Russian language be established by the Fund as well as by other parts of the Ford Foundation, also by those large American private industries, which had established and supported the first Continental Classroom course of physics.

By spring 1959 the Fund made its decision. This was to add chemistry to its 1959-60 educational television program, as a most logical supplement to physics, and to postpone further consideration of mathematics, Russian, and other subjects as new additions. This postponement means that Russian may once more be considered in about a year.

Dr. Parry's report was not meant for publication either wholly or in part. It was to be read by the Fund's administration only. However, a reporter from the Educational Page of The New York Herald Tribune somehow gained access to one of the few copies of the report, and wrote and published an article purporting to give a summary of Dr. Parry's report. He must have read the report quite hastily, for his summary was a far cry from Dr. Parry's facts and conclusions. The reporter's

erroneous article, after appearing in The New York Herald Tribune in late April, was syndicated to a number of other newspapers in the United States and Canada, and was commented upon in editorials in still other newspapers, also with regrettable mistakes, these being caused by the Herald Tribune's unfortunate statement in the first instance. Among others, the New York Novoye Russkoye Slovo and the Waterbury, Conn. American ran such erroneous editorials, based on the misleading article in the Herald Tribune. Dr. Parry's immediate letters of correction were at once published by Novoye Russkoye Slovo and the Waterbury American. The latter even ran an additional editorial, expressing the newspaper's regret that it had been misled. However, the editors of the Herald Tribune refused to publish Dr. Parry's letter of correction, and in so doing gave to Dr. Parry and to the Fund vague reasons for the refusal which were found not at all convincing.

Dr. Parry is a longtime member of the AATSEEL and is currently president of the New York-New Jersey Regional Chapter of our Association. In his report to the Fund, and in his conferences with the officials of the Fund and of other parts of the Ford Foundation, he used the opportunity to acquaint them with the work of the AATSEEL in the field of Russian-language instruction in America.

Publications of Pedagogical Interest

Beginning Audio-Lingual Materials, Russian: A Series of Experimental Units for Teaching Some Basic Sound and Structure Patterns to Secondary School Students in the First Weeks of a Beginning Course, has been prepared under the provisions of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, Title VI, Language Development Program, as a co-operative project of the Glastonbury Public Schools, Glastonbury, Conn., and the U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The co-ordinator of the working committees is Mary P. Thompson, Director of Curriculum and Instruction, Glastonbury Public Schools; the Russian materials were prepared by Rostislav Rozdestvensky, Glastonbury Public Schools (Chairman), and Kyra V. Bostroem, Univ. of Conn., Waterbury Branch. The Materials consist of a general "Teacher's Guide" for beginning audio-lingual materials, usable for any modern foreign language (10 pp.), and four Russian units, "Before Class," "In the Library," "Lunch Time," and "After School" (18 pp.), plus two pages of examples of testing materials for Russian. An evaluation questionnaire is supplied, to be returned to Miss Thompson.

Harold T. Treacy has developed on his own initiative the "Status of Russian in California Schools," General Delivery, Stanford, Cal., to function as a consultation center for educators in California schools who wish to develop their Russian language programs. He has prepared materials of general interest. He has published a dittoed, useful Annotated Compilation of Russian Language Teaching Aids and Instructional Materials (SRCS 25.III.59; 34, 2 pp.; \$0.25), and Audio-Visual Aids

for Russian Language Teaching (SRCS 29.V.59; 13 pp.), a dictionary of audio-visual aids with discussion and practical suggestion for uses.

Foreign Languages, Grades 7-12, Curriculum Series, No. V. (Tentative), State Department of Education, Hartford, Conn., Sept. 1958 (61 pp.), gives a discussion of "first principles" in modern language teaching and a Curriculum Outline on six different levels, with discussion of skills, structure, content, and class program (including audio-visual aids, homework, measurement). The aural-oral method is emphasized throughout.

The text also includes a section on the teaching of Latin.

References on Foreign Language in the Elementary School, by Marjorie C. Johnston and Ilo Remer (Circular No. 495, Revised, June 1959; Office of Education, Washington 25, D. C.), includes a useful listing of books, bulletins and reports; language journals; service bureaus for teachers; and instructional materials—all for Russian, as well as other languages, on the elementary level.

As this goes to press, we have been assured that Materials in Russian of Possible Use in High School Classes (Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Circular 592), by Ilo Remer, will be available for distribution to AATSEEL members along with this issue of the Journal. We feel that this will be a publication of great value, and we are grateful to Miss Remer and the U. S. Office of Education for making it available.

Forthcoming 1959 AATSEEL Annual Meeting

The 1959 annual meeting of the AATSEEL will take place in the Sheraton Room in the Sheraton-Blackstone Hotel, Michigan Ave. at Balbo, Chicago, Ill., on Dec. 27 and 28. Special rates of \$7 single and \$12 double have been set for AATSEEL members who so indicate on their requests for reservations.

AATSEEL members are reminded that those wishing to read papers must present them to the Secretary-Treasurer early, for the program is expected to be completely made up by October 1. A notice regarding the meeting, including the planned program, will be sent out to the membership in November.

TRANSLITERATION

The following transliteration system will be used in this Journal for transliterating Cyrillic:

А а	а	Ј ј	ј	҆ ҇	ћ
Б б	б	Ќ ќ	ќ	Џ Џ	(SC, M) дž
В в	в	Ќ ќ	ќ	Ш Ш	š
Г г	(U, BR) g	Л л	л	Ш Ш	(B, SC) št (all others) šč
Г г	(U, BR) h	Љ љ	(SC, M) lj	" Ђ т	(B) ё (all others) "
Ѓ ѓ	(all others) g	М м	м	" Ѓ у	
Ѓ ѓ	(M) g	Н н	н	Њ Њ	
Д д	d	Њ Њ	(SC, M) nj	њ њ	у
Ђ ђ	(SC) dj	О о	о	Ђ ђ	ј
Е е	e	П п	p	Ӡ Ӡ	ë
Ӗ Ӗ	ӗ	Р р	r	Ӭ ӭ	ë
Ӗ Ӗ	(U) je	С с	s	Ӥ Ӯ	ju
Ӣ Ӣ	(SC) je	Т т	t	Ӣ Ӣ	ja
Ӯ Ӯ	ӝ	Ӣ Ӣ	(SC) ċ	Ӯ Ӯ	f
Ӯ Ӯ	ӟ	Ӯ Ӯ	u	Ӯ Ӯ	i
Ӯ Ӯ	(M, CS) dz	Ӯ Ӯ	(CS) u	Ӯ Ӯ	(CS) ę
Ӯ Ӯ	(U) y	Ӯ Ӯ	(CS) u	Ӯ Ӯ	(CS) je
Ӯ Ӯ	(all others) i	Ӯ Ӯ	(BR) w	Ӯ Ӯ	(CS) o (B) ё
Ӯ Ӯ	i	Ӯ Ӯ	Ӯ Ӯ	Ӯ Ӯ	
Ӯ Ӯ	(U) ji	Ӯ Ӯ	f	Ӯ Ӯ	
Ӯ Ӯ	j	Ӯ Ӯ	x	Ӯ Ӯ	
		Ӯ Ӯ	c	Ӯ Ӯ	(CS) jo

B — Bulgarian

R — Russian

BR — Belorussian

SC — Serbo-Croatian

CS — Church Slavonic

U — Ukrainian

M — Macedonian

This system will be used consistently, with the following exceptions:

1. Anglicized words such as ruble, kopek, kolkhoz, sovkhoz, Bolshevik, soviet, calash, troika, tsar, boyar, droshky (these spellings will be used, except in linguistic or quoted Cyrillic text, in which case the words will be transliterated according to the table above).
2. The names of individuals who have accepted a Latin-alphabet spelling (e.g., Mirsky).
3. Bibliographical references to materials published in non-Cyrillic languages (e.g., The Letters of Chekhov, as the title of the English-language publication only).
4. Geographical names in widely accepted usage in Anglicized spelling (e.g., Yalta, Moscow).